

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR APRIL, 1832.

- Art. I.—1. *The Divine Authority and Perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day*, asserted in Seven Sermons, delivered at the Parish Church of St. Mary, Islington. By Daniel Wilson, M.A. Vicar. 12mo. pp. 206. Price 2s. 6d. London, 1831.
2. *Brief Remarks on the History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath*. By Joseph John Gurney. Second Edition. 18mo. pp. 103. London, 1831.
3. *Four Lectures on the Law of the Sabbath*, as contained in the Scriptures. By Henry Forster Burder, D.D. 18mo. pp. 111. Price 2s. London, 1831.
4. *Discourses on the Sabbath*. By Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. 12mo. pp. 295. Price 4s. 6d. Glasgow, 1832.
5. *The Modern Sabbath examined*. 8vo. pp. xiv. 297. London, 1832.
6. *The Ordinances of Religion practically illustrated and applied*. By John Davies, B.D. Rector of St. Pancras, Chichester, and Author of "An Estimate of the Human Mind," &c. 8vo. pp. xvi. 308. Price 7s. 6d. London, 1832.
7. *A Treatise on the Authority, Ends, and Observance of the Christian Sabbath*: with an Appendix, containing a Variety of Documentary Evidence respecting prevalent Abuses, and Means for their Suppression. By the Rev. Duncan Macfarlan, Minister of Renfrew. 12mo. pp. 271. Price 4s. Glasgow, 1832.
8. *Three Sermons on the Lord's Day*. By the Rev. John Forbes, Minister of the Outer High Church, Glasgow. 18mo. pp. 118. Glasgow, 1831.
9. *Third Annual Report of the General Union for promoting the Observance of the Christian Sabbath*, presented May 10th, 1831.

With the Proceedings at the Anniversary, &c. 8vo. pp. 24. New York, U.S. 1831.

10. *The Sabbath Question, a Question of Civil and Religious Liberty; or the Legal Establishment of a Weekly Rest essential to the Liberties and the Rights of the People.* 12mo. pp. 48. Price 1s. London, 1831.
11. *The Law of the Sabbath, Religious and Political.* By Josiah Conder. 8vo. pp. 64. Price 2s. 6d. London, 1830.

IT would be unreasonable to expect that the writers of practical treatises should in all cases feel bound to acquaint themselves with what may have been written upon the same subject by their predecessors or contemporaries, whether on their own side or in defence of opposite sentiments. The less of a polemical character such works assume, the better. It is obvious, however, that little advance is likely to be made in settling a long standing controversy, if writers *pro* and *con* decline the trouble of ascertaining the true state of the argument, and evade the very difficulties and reasonings it is their business to grapple with. It is not a little vexatious to find the champions of truth spending all their force in the demolition of abandoned positions, and overlooking the intrenchments of error; nor is it less provoking to find the advocates of erroneous opinions gathering up confuted arguments, and trying to point them afresh, regardless of the discomfiture of their predecessors in the contest. A fair dealing with evidence involves the rendering of full justice to the arguments of an opponent; but this is both more rare and more difficult than is generally supposed. Nor do those writers who seem the most honestly in search of truth, always adhere to this principle of fair dealing. No one will question Archbishop Whately's love of truth; and yet, in his tract upon the Sabbath, he has certainly exhibited no adequate anxiety to make himself acquainted either with the true grounds of the sentiments which he impugns, or with the answers that had been furnished to the objections he brings forward. The fact is, that the learned Prelate is a fearless thinker, but by no means an equally deep and thorough reader; and his apparent unfairness is attributable, simply, perhaps, to the rashness of writing upon such a subject as the Moral Law, without considering or appreciating the language even of the Thirty-nine Articles.

Of the publications now before us, one only has for its avowed object, to *disprove* the perpetuity of the Sabbath, all the others being designed to vindicate and enforce its Divine authority and permanent obligation. The Author of "*The Modern Sabbath Examined*," will have no reason to be offended at being characterized as a disciple of Dr. Whately, with whose writings he is

evidently familiar, and whose independent spirit of inquiry he appears to have caught and emulated. As his volume is of more recent date than the other publications on our list, it might be expected that some of them would have been noticed by him; but we have met with only a passing reference to sentiments advocated in our own pages. Of course, no one of these works can be expected to furnish a direct refutation of the arguments of the present Writer. Under these circumstances, our main business, in resuming a discussion which has already been very fully entered into in our pages *, will be, to examine our Examiner, to point out the errors into which he has fallen, and if possible, to gain over the acute and intelligent mind of the Writer himself to the side of Truth. Dangerous and pernicious as we cannot but deem the sentiments he advocates, not only have we no right to question the purity of his motives, but we really entertain no suspicion of his sincerity, integrity, and love of truth; and we agree with him, that by free and temperate discussion, such as he has here exemplified, truth must be the gainer. Upon the whole, we are not sorry for the appearance of the volume, and have some pleasure in meeting so frank an antagonist; although it would obviously be a great evil, were such a work to remain unanswered.

The Writer has himself felt it necessary to vindicate the course he has adopted, from the odium attaching to sentiments of evil tendency. He premises, that, 'as the subject has been treated 'on purely religious grounds, it has been taken for granted, that 'whatever conclusion relative to it can be correctly deduced from 'an accurate survey of Scriptural evidence, such conclusion must, 'in as far as the interests of the Christian religion are concerned, 'be ultimately found the most expedient in practice.

'On the assumption that this proposition is indubitably correct, the principles derived from Scriptural authority have been followed into all their natural and necessary consequences, without any anxiety being felt for the issue, as it respects the interests of true practical piety. The chief business that men have with Christianity, is to believe what it reveals, and to practice what it enjoins. So soon as it is ascertained what *is* the revealed will of Heaven in regard to any point of faith or practice, there is then plainly *that* ascertained which it must be most expedient for men to believe and to obey. As obedience to the revealed will of God comprehends the whole sum of the duty which

* "The Law of the Sabbath, Religious and Political," &c., is a reprint, with some additions, of two articles which appeared in this Journal. See *Eclectic Review*, June 1830, and Oct. 1830. It may not be improper to acknowledge the polite and handsome terms in which Mr. Wilson, Mr. Davies, and Drs. Burder and Wardlaw refer to those articles.

man owes to his Creator, it is surely warrantable to assume, that the consequences of complying with this rule of duty, may safely be left to Him who has delivered it, and who, in doing so, knew the end from the beginning. In examining any religious observance which claims our notice, we are very apt to consider, first, its *supposed tendency*, and in this way to allow the views we form of the results expected to follow from its adoption, to influence, or perhaps determine our conclusions respecting its divine authority and obligation.' pp. iv, v.

In the sentiments here expressed, we cordially coincide: they are in substance, and almost in words, those which Archbishop Whately has so ably maintained in his admirable Essay on the Love of Truth*. 'Not to countenance any erroneous opinion or delusion, however seemingly beneficial in its results', is, we admit, a duty imperative upon all the disciples of Him who is the Truth, and who seek to be led by the Spirit of Truth. If a belief in the perpetuity of the Sabbath can be demonstrated to be such a delusion,—if the observance be (as this Writer unhesitatingly affirms, but fails altogether to establish,) 'destitute of all legitimate Scriptural proof',—then, to countenance the error, however seemingly beneficial, would, we concede, be inconsistent with fair dealing or Christian integrity, and ultimately with sound policy or practical expediency.

Truth can never be of evil tendency; but, on the other hand, that which is really of evil tendency, cannot be truth. In judging of the apparent tendencies, and inferring the necessary consequences of opinions, we are extremely liable to be misled by preconceived notions; and to reject any opinion purely on the ground of its supposed tendency, without examining the evidence on which it rests, is dangerous and unjustifiable. We must not, however, forget, that the moral tendency of doctrines forms one element of the internal evidence by which their truth is attested; and could we ascertain the inherent tendency of any opinion to be pernicious, we should have something stronger than a mere presumption against the possibility of its being true. It can never be quite safe, therefore, altogether to disregard the apparent or supposed tendency of an opinion, in estimating the evidence for and against its truth. Into this error, a very serious one, the present Writer seems to have fallen at the very outset of his inquiry; and this first mistake has entailed several others.

In examining the Divine authority of a religious observance, it may not be proper to begin our inquiries with asking, What is its tendency? But a becoming self-diffidence may prompt the question, What is the tendency of *my* opinion? A lover of truth does well to risk all the consequences of complying with the

* See Eclectic Review, 3d Series, Vol. I. pp. 124—6.

rule of faith and duty, in obedience to the Divine will. But, in expounding that rule to others, in pronouncing upon what is or is not conformable to the Divine will, it is not so clearly his duty to devolve upon the Divine Being the consequences of what he may believe to be true, but which may be error. There may be much presumption and enthusiasm in such a disregard of consequences. If, in our private search after truth, we dismiss all fear of consequences resulting to ourselves from the conclusions to which we may be conducted, we cherish a temper the most favourable, when combined with a devout spirit, to the attainment of satisfaction. But no one who has not a special commission from Heaven, is called upon to promulgate his opinions, regardless of their consequences *to others*. He ought to be prepared to shew that they are beneficial, or his motives in propagating them will be justly liable to suspicion, as partaking more of vanity than of benevolence, and as justifying the rebuke, Who has required this at your hands?

The Author of the volume before us, has, we doubt not, persuaded himself that he has performed an acceptable service to religion, in endeavouring to shew that a weekly day of rest is really no part of the revealed will of God,—because, as he would argue, such an opinion being erroneous, it cannot be ultimately for the interest of religion that the error should prevail. But what precise service he designed to render to the Christian world, is not very apparent. The reader will naturally and not very unreasonably inquire, what is the drift of the volume,—what end the Writer has proposed to himself. Supposing that he has established his point, that the modern Sabbath rests upon no Divine authority, what does he wish us to do? Abolish the day of rest? No. Strange to say, while denying the existence of a Sabbatical law, as an ordinance of revealed religion, he decidedly advocates the expediency of a periodical intermission of public labour. Not only is ‘the supposed tendency’ of the observance admitted to be good, but its beneficial tendency is adduced as a reason for its being politically enforced, although it is held to furnish no portion of evidence in favour of its Divine authority. The Sabbath is confessedly an invaluable blessing, but we are not indebted for it to the Founder of Christianity; it is not the ordinance of the Divine wisdom. Such is substantially the representation of the Writer.

‘It is manifest’, he says, ‘that, apart from all considerations of its religious obligation, the observance of a day of public rest confers a very valuable privilege on all classes of the community. The regular recurrence of a day of relaxation from the exhausting labours of life, is greatly conducive both to bodily health and to mental vigour: it lightens, by the prospect it affords of a temporary cessation of uninter-

mitting application, the burden which the labouring man is obliged daily to bear, while it alleviates the fatigue of all those wearisome avocations in which the bulk of mankind find it necessary to engage. To all who are thus circumstanced, it is an unspeakable satisfaction to possess the privilege of at all times looking forward to a point at which they may suspend their exertions, and recruit their exhausted powers; it nerves them for vigorous and persevering application, to know that the day which they can call their own will shortly return, in which they may again repose from the fatiguing labours of the week, and enjoy endearing intercourse with their families and friends. A day of this kind, it is obvious, affords numerous opportunities, not only for the natural exercise of the social affections, and for all the enjoyments of domestic intercourse, but also for mental cultivation, and the diffusion of general, as well as religious knowledge: and it cannot be doubted, that if these opportunities be judiciously employed, they must conduce greatly to the progress of society in civilization, and in the attainment of every kind of valuable information, as well as to the amelioration of the general condition of the human race.' pp. 3, 4.

'It is gratifying to have it in our power to remark, that, though there has long prevailed a great diversity of opinion respecting the observance of a weekly day of rest, considered as a religious obligation, all parties seem cordially to unite in approving of the civil enforcement of a periodical intermission of public labour. Instead of it being desirable to procure a repeal of the statutes now in force, which enjoin an observance of Sunday, it is deserving of serious consideration, whether a revisal of the existing statutes, with a view to remedy their partial operation, and to increase, in various ways, their efficiency, would not be highly expedient.' p. 279.

This is very good, so far as it goes; and we fervently wish the Writer were warranted in his representation, that 'all parties seem cordially to unite in approving of the *civil* enforcement of a day of rest.' Unhappily, the fact is notoriously different. Neither among those who hold the religious obligation of the Sabbath, nor among those who contend for the observance on other grounds, is there found this general consent as to the province of the Legislature. And assuredly the Writer's labours will very little contribute to promote a general conviction in favour of the civil enforcement of the day. To recur, then, to the design and end of his publication,—if the Sabbath be a benefit, and its civil enforcement be desirable, how has it happened that a Writer convinced of this, should have tasked himself to compose, and felt bound to publish, a work, the tendency, nay, the laboured object of which is, to destroy all regard and reverence for the day as a religious Institution? The inconsistency of such a proceeding, is not to be explained by referring it to a love of truth for its own sake. Of the two opinions or conclusions adopted by the present Writer, one is, that the modern Sabbath is an institution greatly conducive to the general melioration of the human race, an in-

valuable privilege to the community, and one which claims to be enforced by the civil power : the other is, that the whole Christian world have laboured under a delusion in supposing that any argument in favour of this inestimable Institution can be derived from the word of God. In a person holding the latter opinion, it would obviously be wrong and dishonest, to advance or to countenance any argument drawn from religious considerations, and which he must deem fallacious, in favour of the former position, that the Sabbath is nevertheless worthy to be observed. Yet, one might naturally have expected that such a Writer's main anxiety would be, to establish, on what he deems the true grounds, a principle of so much practical importance, and, if possible, to place the advantages of the Sabbath in so strong a light, that its observance should not require to be enforced by any unsound or fallacious arguments. While scrupulously abstaining from employing error as an auxiliary, the Writer was bound to shew himself chiefly bent upon establishing what he admits as truth by a train of independent argument. 'I am unable, for such and such reasons', it might have been said, 'to concur with those worthy theologians who contend for the Divine authority of the Lord's Day ; but, being as deeply convinced as they are, of the expediency of such an Institution, I have composed the ensuing treatise in order to illustrate the political wisdom of enforcing a day of rest.' By a volume written with this object and in this spirit, the Author might have laid the public under no small obligation ; and widely as we should still have differed from him, we should have hailed him as an auxiliary. *Why* did not his work assume this shape ? *Why* has he given us only two meagre paragraphs in support of the Institution he approves, and written nearly 300 pages to disprove its religious obligation ? *Why* so much more zeal to demolish a fallacious argument in favour of a good conclusion, than to establish that conclusion on better premises ? How comes a religious Inquirer to be so acute and energetic in exposing the delusions of the pious, and so lukewarm in advocating the interests of public morality ? The book is, on the Author's own principles, a moral absurdity : for the whole tenor of it is at direct war with the only practical conclusion which is distinctly announced ; namely, that the Sabbath ought to be observed. In this, he agrees with those who maintain the religious obligation, although he arrives at the conclusion by quite another process ; but in the Treatise itself, the point of agreement is scarcely adverted to, and the points of difference are exclusively dwelt upon. Had the Spirit of Truth guided the Author's inquiry, would not the case have been reversed ?

In expressing ourselves thus strongly as to the radical defect of the work, we must beg not to be misunderstood as insinuating an impeachment of the motives and intentions of the Writer. We

believe him to be in error, and that error has blinded his eyes to the nature of the course he was pursuing. We shall endeavour presently to trace that error to its first principle; but we have deemed it important to shew, that we are justified in demanding of a writer who steps forward to assail established and cherished principles, what he has to offer us in compensation,—what benefit he proposes to confer. If this be called prejudice, it is a salutary and conservative prejudice, injurious only when it leads us to resist the clear light of evidence. But Truth always bears credentials. Miraculous credentials were necessary to render those inexcusable who rejected the Divine Teacher*; and the credentials of beneficent practical tendency are still required to authenticate dogmatic instruction. It seems to us that the purest love of truth, the soundest philosophy, warrants the precaution of entering upon a proposed inquiry, under the proffered guidance of a stranger, with a very distinct appreciation of the consequences to which his reasonings are intended to conduct us, or would infallibly lead. Now the plain consequences of what this volume holds up as *truth*, are,—that sabbath-breaking cannot be regarded as among our national sins which call for repentance;—that the breach of the Fourth Commandment is no offence against either God or man, not involving the disregard of any moral or religious obligation;—that what may more truly be regarded as a national sin, is, the teaching the people to repeat the Ten Commandments under the erroneous notion that they are binding upon Christians, whereas they are ‘wholly inconsistent with the nature of Christian liberty;’—that the doctrine of a Christian Sabbath ranks in fact among ‘pious frauds,’ which, with other errors of Romanism, are at all hazards to be discountenanced;—and that the Decalogue ought therefore to be erased from the walls of every Christian church. The Writer cannot accuse us of over-stating the plain consequences of the opinions he has so zealously advocated; and he is too honest and ingenuous to wish us to conceal them. Nay, we give him this advantage in stating the true nature of the paradox he undertakes to prove, before we enter upon the examination of his arguments; that a presumption is afforded, by the very startling nature of these consequences, in favour of the irresistible force of the evidence which has led the Writer to embrace them. How strong must be the reasons, how worthy of being attentively listened to and seriously weighed, which he has to bring forward in support of such unpromising *truths*!

But what if those reasons are nothing better than pure negations,—nothing more than the alleged insufficiency of proof in favour of the Divine authority of the day,—nothing more than

* John xv. 24.

the Writer's mere *opinion*, that the evidence usually relied upon is unsatisfactory ! That this is the fact, will be seen from a brief analysis of his argument.

In the first section, the Writer insists upon the importance of distinguishing 'the political regulation of a periodical intermission of public labour, from the Law of the Sabbath viewed as a Divine Institution.' 'All matters of a religious nature, whether of religious belief or of religious duty, belong, as such, to the Divine government, and are beyond the cognizance of human legislation. Men's actions are proper subjects of human legislation: their religious belief lies between God and their own consciences.' These axioms, we need not say, are with us admitted principles; and we fully concur with the Writer, in the position, that 'although the observance of a weekly day of public rest was probably viewed by the civil legislature, at the period of its enactment, as a religious obligation, it is utterly impossible that it can ever be enforced as a *religious duty* by the sword of the civil magistracy.' The Writer proceeds to remark, that, 'as every moral law is from its own nature obligatory on the human race, all civil enactments which are founded on the principles of truth and equity, must in one sense be both laws of God and of man;'—that these principles 'are with manifest propriety recognized by the legislature of every civilized nation';—and he further admits, that if the regulation of enforcing the observance of a day of rest be considered as conducive to the well-being of the community, 'there can be no reasonable objection advanced against the adoption of such a regulation, or to its general enforcement by magisterial authority.' But the point at which he starts off from us, is this. He thinks that the civil Legislature is warranted in assuming certain moral obligations which are founded upon the will of God, and which are called principles of truth and equity, but that it is not warranted in assuming certain other moral obligations which are distinguishable as *religious*. The Legislature may *assume* that perjury is a crime, or, in other words, that every man is morally bound to speak the truth; but it may not assume that there is a God; that man is religiously bound to worship Him; and that he claims to be protected in the discharge of that obligation. And why may not this be assumed by the civil Legislature? Not because any rational doubt can exist upon the subject, but because there are some certain truths, it seems, which the civil Legislature is bound *not to know*; among which truths are, the being and the revealed will of the Moral Governor of the Universe, and the primary, universal obligations of His creatures! We must transcribe the reasoning by which it is attempted to shew the illegitimacy of the assumption, on the part of the Legislature, of the religious obligation of keeping a Sabbath.

‘ It is to be observed, that if the assumptions referred to *be expressed in the statute*,—if they be assigned as the ground of its enactment, and as the reason for its being enforced, it will be difficult to justify the law on the principles of sound government, or to defend it from the charge of infringing on the rights of private conscience. The introduction of a religious doctrine into a political enactment, and an assumption that all the members of the State recognize the obligation implied in it, seem to be inconsistent alike with the principles of religious freedom, and with all correct views of the nature and objects of civil legislation. . . . In every free government, where there are no civil distinctions made on account of men’s different religious opinions, it must be alike unjust and inconsistent, to assume the obligation of a controverted religious doctrine as a proper reason for the enactment of a civil statute. It is obvious, that every member of the State, who dissents from the doctrine on which this obligation is founded, has a just reason of complaint, that he is called upon to give his consent to the enactment of a law which implies the existence of a religious doctrine to which he is conscientiously opposed. To ground the law of the sabbath as a political regulation, upon an antecedent religious obligation, would not be felt to be any grievance, so long as all the members of the State admitted the existence of this obligation ; (although even then, the legislature would appear to be transgressing the limits of its legitimate jurisdiction ;) but so soon as any individual member of the State dissented from the doctrine on which this obligation was founded, the ground on which the law rested, would, as regarded him, be wholly subverted, and the enactment would necessarily become an odious interference with the rights of private conscience.’ pp. 14—16.

It would lead us too far from our present subject, to enter into an examination of the Writer’s political theory, which corresponds to nothing in history, in fact, or in reason. His implied notions of social rights, involve assumptions of the most extravagant description, and which would render every species of government a modification of injustice. Even the American theory of free government does not affect to concede to each social unit this hypothetical share of legislative power, that would entitle him to be called upon to give his consent to the very wording of every enactment. Neither civil nor religious liberty depends for its existence upon such impossible and absurd conditions. The introduction of a religious doctrine into a political enactment may not be, in most cases, expedient ; but that it infringes upon religious liberty, the Writer has not even attempted to shew : he seems to have deemed it self-evident, whereas it is not even a plausible fallacy. The existence of Satan may be viewed as a religious doctrine, and it is one which is assumed in certain forms of legal indictment. Whether this be expedient or not, will the Writer pretend to say, that the religious freedom of the subject is trenched upon by this language ? The immortality of the soul is a religious doctrine : would an assumption that all the members of the State recognize

the obligation implied in it, be at variance with the principles of religious freedom? But the Writer may claim to qualify his position, as referring to a *controverted* religious doctrine, and to its introduction as a reason for the enactment of a civil statute. We admit that the case is hardly supposable, in which this would be either proper or expedient. But the question is, whether the referring to such a reason for the enactment, the statute being in itself recommended by political wisdom, would be an injustice, an injury to any members of the community, as an infringement upon the principles of religious freedom. What religious doctrine is not controverted? Christianity itself is controverted by the Turk, the Jew, and the Infidel. To assume the obligations which it involves, would then, it seems, be 'an odious interference with the rights of private conscience'! Truly, this style of reasoning can tend only to bring the rights of conscience into question, by making them seem so indefinite, so exorbitant, and so arbitrary as to be incompatible with the conditions of society.

If the Government or Legislature requires me to profess to believe what I do not believe, all persons will admit that it interferes with the right of conscience; but strange and monstrous indeed is the position, that the Government must not profess to believe what *I* do not believe,—must not take for granted matters of common belief and general recognition, from which *I* dissent. Yet, the Writer's argument comes to this. He is not quarrelling with the enactment on the ground of its being itself an infringement upon liberty, or of its requiring more than the State has a right to ordain; for he admits, that to command a cessation from public labour, comes within the province of the civil Legislature, and that 'men are unquestionably bound to comply with the ob-servance as the law of the land.' Few persons will agree with him on this last point, who adopt his notions of religious liberty. But the grievance of which he complains, as an infringement of the principles of religious freedom, is simply the expression of any religious opinion on the part of the Legislature, from which an individual member of the State may dissent! That a legislative body should presume to take it for granted, that all the members of the community recognize the religious obligation of keeping the Ten Commandments, is, we learn, utterly incompatible with all correct views of the nature and objects of civil legislation. The said Legislature may, if it so please, enact the Ten Commandments as a political regulation on the ground of social utility; but all religious obligations must be carefully kept out of sight in legislative enactments, or there is an end of religious liberty! Even the fact, that the Sabbath has been recognised by the common consent of Christians, is not to be whispered within the walls of parliament, since this would be an infringe-

ment upon the sensitiveness of private conscience. Can any position be more monstrous? As advocates of the principles of civil and religious liberty, we must protest against their being held answerable for consequences or inferences of so glaring absurdity.

If the regulation of enforcing the observance of a day of rest, be considered as conducive to the well-being of the community, there can be no reasonable objection, we are told, against the legislative enactment of such a regulation, or against its general enforcement by magisterial authority. But what clearer right has the legislative body to assume the political doctrine, that a day of rest is necessary to the well-being of the community, than it has to assume the religious doctrine of the antecedent religious obligation? The one is just as controvertible a doctrine as the other; and with none, in fact, has the political expediency of observing a day of rest ever appeared to have much weight, who have denied its moral obligation. The interference of the Legislature in enforcing the Sabbath on the ground of public utility, would be resented quite as warmly, and with more decency, than its enforcement as a law of morality. Yet, this Writer maintains, that 'the attempt to increase the authority and stability of the law, by refusing to recognize the expediency of the regulation as its proper foundation, and to substitute a religious doctrine as the proper ground on which it ought to rest,—is *obviously* to remove it from a foundation of rock, and to place it on one of sand.' This language is borrowed from Dr. Whately; only, his rock is of different formation: not expediency, but '*the power of the Church*,'—not this Writer's sand-stone, but Roman tufa. The one is speaking of the religious, the other of the political obligation; but they unite in the confident allegation, that the Decalogue is nothing better, in comparison, than a foundation of sand. This sounds very much like impiety, but our readers will recollect that these Writers have adopted the belief, that the Ten Commandments have been abrogated. Were this indeed the case, we wish to be informed, upon what foundation of rock, the expediency of enforcing the observance of a seventh day, rather than an eighth or a tenth, can be placed. If the judgement of the Legislature upon this point be 'the only tenable footing upon which a municipal law of this nature can ever consistently be placed,' and the matter is one of mere 'option and expediency,' by what process of reasoning shall it be established, that the well-being of the community will be best promoted by fixing upon one day in seven, and that one day of the week the first? No doubt, most ingenious reasons could be found for making the day of rest occur every tenth day, or for altering the Sabbath from Sunday to Wednesday. Were this

deemed convenient and expedient, according to this Writer, there would be no rational objection against the change.*

And yet, 'it is readily admitted,' he says, 'that no human power, whether of the Church or the State, can originate or set aside a Divine institution. Whether, however, a weekly Sabbath continues, under the Christian dispensation, *to be* a Divine institution, has hitherto been a matter of doubtful disputation, on which it seems very unnatural to think that civil governments ought to be called upon to deliver an opinion.' Nevertheless, civil governments are called upon to act, in the very matter in which they ought not, it seems, to have an opinion. They have to determine whether they shall enforce or set aside—there is no alternative—what is, in its nature and origin, a Divine institution, and is still held to be such by the vast majority of the best informed and pious members of the community. Silence, the Government may maintain on such a point; it may decline the recognition *in words* of the 'theological dogma;' but neutrality is impracticable. And if the legislative enactment be really determined by the fact, or by the common belief in the fact, that the Sabbath is of Divine appointment, then the concealment of the reason, the pretence that expediency alone has determined the law, is a useless affectation of irreligion. It is plain, after all, that the concession is made to religion, but that the politician is ashamed of it, and wishes to find an excuse for it in the utility of the Institution; although, but for the religious obligation, its utility would never have been thought of. Is hypocrisy one of the virtues of a free government?

If whether the Sabbath be a divine institution or not, is a matter of doubtful disputation, it is at least *possible*, that the Divine law may continue to be in force. But let it be deemed at least supposable, and let our opponent for a moment grant, that no doubt existed on the subject; we wish to know whether, in that case, the government of a country would be at liberty to take cognizance of the institution as one of Divine appointment, and to assume the moral obligation arising out of it, as the reason of a civil enactment. What would be the duty of the civil government, if it were unquestioned, that a law which no human power can set aside, is still in force? Our opponent will perhaps admit, that no wrong would then be done, no grievance could be felt, by grounding the political enactment on the religious obligation. And yet, if the nature, and objects, and proper limits of legislation forbid the taking cognizance of a religious obligation that is doubtful, they would not the less preclude all direct cognizance of

* We wish that the Writer had given his authority for attributing such sentiments to Tindal and Calvin. The language of the latter, in his 'Institutes,' warrants no such representation.

one that was unequivocal and certain. Its being doubtful or not, can really make no difference in the business. Whether the Government assumes that which is certain, or that which is only probable, the assumption can no more infringe upon religious liberty in the one case, than in the other: only it is supported by a greater or smaller degree of evidence. If the object of the enactment falls within the province of the Legislature, and the enactment itself is conducive to the welfare of society, shall it be construed into an offence, that the Government conceived itself to be therein acting in conformity to the revealed will of God? Would not a mere probability that the Law of the Sabbath is binding, be a sufficient reason for not daring to set it aside; sufficient evidence, or rational probability, being all that is attainable in a thousand cases that call for practical decision? If the Legislature affected to create a new religious obligation, this would indeed be to infringe upon the Divine prerogative, and to interfere with the conscience; but, in simply recognizing a religious obligation as the justification of its own procedure,—as the highest reason, though not the only one, which recommends the enactment to compliance,—even if that obligation be ambiguous or imaginary, it leaves every man in undisturbed possession of his convictions as to the antecedent obligation; requiring, not his faith in the reasons, but his compliance with the provisions of the enactment. Surely, then, to quarrel with the reasons, because we happen to dissent from them, displays not a little unreasonableness on the part of those who, after all, approve of the law. Again, we say, let not the principles of religious liberty be held answerable for these refinements of polemical jealousy, which, followed out to their full extent, would make it incompatible with a free toleration of religious opinions, for a Government to profess itself Christian, or to afford the slightest countenance to any measures for evangelizing the world.

We have dwelt the longer upon this point, because, both in our country and in America, there have prevailed very extensively, even among those who acknowledge the Divine authority of the Sabbath, objections against its legal enforcement, as inconsistent with the rights of conscience*. 'On principles of an equality of

* It appears from the Third Report of the "General Union for promoting the Observance of the Christian Sabbath", in the United States, that the attempts which are being made to effect a repeal of the law that requires the opening of post-offices on the Sabbath, are decried by the opponents, as being 'inconsistent with a free toleration of religious opinions and the rights of man.' The Committee have deemed it right to take no part, *officially*, in the application to Congress; but they distinctly avow, that, 'with hundreds of thousands of their fellow-citizens, all of whom exult in the wise provision of the national charter, that no preference shall ever be given to any deno-

‘civil rights, and the removal of all civil distinctions on account of men’s religious opinions,’ the present Writer contends in the true spirit of an American republican, ‘it must be wholly inconsistent to place the secular enactment which enjoins the observance of a day of public rest, on any other foundation than its recognized expediency.’ Many go further, and say, it must be wholly inconsistent to have any secular enactment at all on the subject. And certainly, if the principles of civil equality are violated by the assigning of religious reasons for the enactment, they cannot be saved from violation by the mere artifice of merging those reasons in general expediency. We have endeavoured to shew, that no infringement of religious liberty is involved in the assumption, on the part of the Legislature, of the moral obligation of keeping the Sabbath, and of the common consent of Christians respecting it. Were it otherwise, we should say, that the infringement upon religious liberty would be justified by the paramount public duty, and that no possible evil could arise from an infringement so beneficial. But is it not ridiculous to represent the countenance given to an opinion—supposing it to be a mere opinion—by an act of the legislature, as amounting to the same thing as an unjust preference of individuals on the ground of religious opinion? To proclaim, nay, to assume, that the Fourth Commandment is binding, is to patronize a sect,—to shew an unjust partiality to the denomination who keep holy the Lord’s Day;—it is an odious interference with the rights of man. Can this reasoning impose upon any one?

We are not contending, however, that it is the business of the Legislature to enforce either moral or religious duties as such. There are many duties of the most binding nature, which cannot be enforced by the power of the magistrate, and crimes of deep atrocity, which human legislation cannot reach. But we maintain, that moral and religious obligations must be the basis of all wise legislation,—that they must be assumed as such,—and that they form the reason, though not the legitimate object, of political laws. This will scarcely be denied with regard to moral obligations; but the present Writer, and those who think with him, deny that any moral obligation is connected with the Sabbath. In their language, the law of the Sabbath is a mere theological dogma; and a belief in the obligation of observing it, is derided as worthy only of ‘weak and timid minds.’ ‘It would undoubtedly involve a moral wrong,’ it is said, ‘to attempt to reverse

mination of Christians,—they have considered the law in question as ‘an unhappy and baneful provision, an infringement on the civil rights of the people, virtually excluding conscientious men from holding the office, and at the same time pouring contempt on the sacred law of Heaven—“Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy.”’

'any moral precept whatever'; 'nor can human authority reverse 'the law of the Sabbath, if it be actually in force *now*, as a law of 'heaven.' But not only is this denied, but it is boldly affirmed, that the law of the Sabbath never was a moral precept, and has no foundation in 'the nature of things.' The following passage will shew that, with all his anxiety to keep clear of 'rash and 'unbecoming dogmatism', the Writer sometimes forgets himself, and becomes both dogmatical and flippant.

'They who can acquiesce in the extraordinary dogma, that one portion of time is more holy *in its nature* than another, are no doubt at perfect liberty to act on their own convictions of religious truth and duty; but it seems very unreasonable, that this apparently incredible notion should be forced upon others, whose minds, it may be, are too logically constructed to allow them to acquiesce in its accuracy. And it seems to be especially unreasonable, that civil governments should be called upon to acknowledge its correctness and obligation, on the penalty of being denounced as vile Atheists, who presume to oppose the eternal moral laws of the Deity.

'The error of confounding people's own interpretation of the law of duty with the law itself, and of condemning, on the ground of this private interpretation, every action of others which is not sanctioned by it, constitutes the very essence of intolerance, and has long been the fruitful source of innumerable forms of unchristian usurpation and spiritual oppression. It is a gross fallacy to represent the law, "Thou shalt not steal," and an injunction to sanctify a determinate portion of time, as laws alike eternal and immutable in their obligation. The former is a moral duty, being founded on the nature of things; and its obligation is recognized by the human conscience, independent of any specific enactment. The latter is a positive law, because it derives its obligation wholly from the promulgation of an express precept. The one is commanded because it is right; the other is right solely because it is commanded. This distinction between the positive character of the law of the sabbath, and the moral nature of all laws founded on the principles of the love of God and our neighbour, is one of the principal points on which the controversy regarding the perpetuity of the sabbatical law hinges.' pp. 22, 23.

The error 'of confounding people's own interpretation of the 'law of duty with the law itself', is a very prevalent and mischievous one; but we are at a loss to perceive how this error can be the *essence* of intolerance. We must remind the Writer, that intolerance is an attribute, not of opinions, right or wrong, but of the moral sentiments. The error he speaks of, may cloud the judgement of the most tolerant and liberal of men; and it is assuredly the capital blunder which constitutes, if not the essence, the basis of his own reasonings. His erroneous interpretation of the Fourth Commandment is made the pretext for impugning the obligation of observing it, and for even depreciating the wisdom of the Divine ordinance. To affirm of any Divine precept, that it

is right, solely because it is commanded, appears to us most presumptuous, and almost amounts to saying, that the command is itself unreasonable or arbitrary. True, the rites and institutes of the Levitical law were right, because ordained by Divine authority, which was a sufficient reason for observing them; but even those positive, temporary, and emblematic ordinances were related to laws eternal and immutable, and were not commanded without a reason, or without reference to an ulterior purpose. In the Divine legislation, what is positive, always rests upon what is moral; and to oppose positive laws to moral obligations, is to oppose particulars to generals, circumstantials to essentials. We grant the distinction, but reject both the terms of the proposition, and its application, as grossly fallacious.

What the Writer means by one portion of time's being more holy *in its nature* than another, we must leave him to explain. He is very fond of the phrase, 'the nature of things'; and if there are any individuals who adopt the foolish imagination he speaks of, it must be philosophers of his own school, or such as, with Philo the Jew, dream that God chose the seventh day out of regard to the power and virtue attaching to the mystic number seven. In attributing so extraordinary a dogma to those who contend for the moral nature of the duty enjoined by the law of the Sabbath, he is chargeable either with an unaccountable misapprehension or a most unworthy artifice. With as much propriety he might deny the moral nature of the second commandment; and adopting Jeremy Bentham's exposition of it, as a law against sculpture, painting, and engraving,—an exposition quite worthy of ranking with the present Writer's interpretation of the fourth,—sneer at those who can acquiesce in the extraordinary dogma, that there is any thing criminal, in the nature of things, in sculpturing graven images. To deny that the Fourth Commandment is one of the laws 'founded upon the principles of the love of 'God and our neighbour', is to deny to the Decalogue as a whole, the character and interpretation assigned to it by Our Lord himself, and to reject, in wilful perversion of the text, the inspired comment.

We have elsewhere cited the admission of Heylin, that the Fourth Commandment is 'moral as to the duty', inasmuch as 'there must be a time appointed for the service of God'; and 'as moral, placed among the Ten Commandments, extending to 'all mankind'. Mr. Gurney justly describes it as 'rendering 'the regular worship of God *practicable*, by breaking the train 'of our temporal pursuits, and by setting apart one day in seven 'for this express purpose.' That with Christian men 'every day 'ought to be as a sabbath-day', may be understood in a good sense; but taken literally, the assertion is both false in itself, and a cruel mockery of the hard condition of the children of toil.

Yes, the monk in the cloister, the philosopher in his closet, the religious mystic, or the wealthy devotee may, if they please, keep sabbath every day. But go tell the working man,—the poor pallid inmates of the stifling manufactory,—the negro in the plantations, that with them ‘every day ought to be as a sabbath’. Go and tell them, that the law of mercy which says, “Six days shalt thou labour, but on the seventh thou shalt rest”, is repealed,—repealed by the compassionate Saviour of the world;—that it belonged exclusively to a dispensation of rigour and severity, and was a figure only of their present happy condition of perpetual rest and blessedness under the Christian dispensation. Go and tell them, that to rob the master of a shilling, is forbidden by the eighth commandment: *that* is still in force. But for the master to rob the slave of the rest God has ordained for him,—of the day which is as much *his* property as the land is the property of the owner,—is no longer a crime, no longer involves any moral wrong, because the commandment which forbids this, is no longer in force. And let the precious reason be added: the law which forbade one description of robbery was a moral law; the law which forbade the other description was a positive law: the law which protects the master was moral; the law which protects the servant is positive, and has nothing to do with moral obligation: the law which guards property is moral; the law which provides a time for the worship of God, and lets in the consolations of religion to the children of toil and oppression, is positive—figurative—purely Levitical, binding only in the apprehension of weak and timid minds; and to enforce this obligation would be an ‘odious interference with the rights of private conscience.’

‘Moral precepts,’ according to Bishop Butler, ‘are those the reasons of which we see: positive precepts are those the reasons of which we do not see. Moral duties arise out of the nature of the case itself; positive duties from external commands.’ Will any one pretend to say, that the reasons of the Fourth Commandment are not to be seen, when the *expediency* of such an institution, as conducive to the well-being of society, is admitted even by those who deny the moral nature of the law? Is not the nature of the case plain enough, that, but for the Sabbath, there would be for the greater portion of mankind no opportunity for religion? Dr. Burder, after citing Bishop Butler’s definition, justly remarks, that the claim of the Fourth Commandment to the character of a moral precept cannot be invalidated by the circumstance, ‘that there is superadded to its *moral* requirements a ‘*positive* direction, simply because that positive direction was necessary to guide the act of obedience to the *morality* of the precept.’ The positive regulation is simply intended ‘to enable us to secure the right proportion of time for the purpose required, and to facilitate the arrangements necessary for public

‘as well as private worship, so that we may render simultaneous ‘obedience to the holy precept.’ (*Four Lectures*, &c. pp. 48, 49.) Dr. Wardlaw has some very judicious observations bearing upon the same point. He commences them by remarking, that ‘even ‘on the supposition of its being entirely positive, the conclusion ‘against the permanence of the law would be too hasty.’

‘If, indeed, it could be proved, that it belonged to the positive institutions *peculiar to the Mosaic economy*, it might not be so easy to evade the inference. But from the mere admission of its positive nature, the inference is not legitimate. That it *may* be abrogated, is a fair deduction: that it *must*, is more than the admission warrants. The question comes to be one of fact. Has it been divinely instituted? and if it has, has it been divinely repealed? Persons are apt to fancy, that, in order to prove an ancient Institution not to be binding, they have nothing to do but to shew it to be of what they call a positive nature. But this is obviously a mistake. An observance which can plead the positive enactments of divine authority, is as really of moral obligation, so long as it continues unrepealed, as if it were one of the eternal and universal principles of right and wrong. Who will presume to interpose his authority, to set aside what the will of Deity has enacted? No will but his own can abrogate his own institutions. In the case of the institutions of the Mosaic ceremonial, we have his revealed will for their abrogation as well as for their observance. We know from himself, that their use was partial and transient. But we distinctly deny, and have endeavoured formerly to assign good reason for the denial, that the Sabbath was at all one of the peculiarities of that dispensation. And if we have succeeded in making good our point, that it had its origin at creation,—we have, on Dr. Paley’s own admission, equally succeeded in settling the question of its universal and permanent obligation. Let its nature be what you will—moral, or positive, or mixed,—it is a divine institution; a divine institution, not for the Jews alone, but for mankind; and for mankind, not during a limited period only, but to all generations. The question, therefore, of its moral or positive nature, is not a question of which the settlement is indispensable to our argument respecting its permanence:—for, although the establishment of its moral character might, on the one hand, infer its perpetuity, the proof of its being entirely positive, would not, on the other, infer its cessation.

‘But it will not, surely, be disputed, that the worship of God, and the cultivation of the principles of piety, are duties of a moral nature. What duties can be more so? They belong to the first and highest of all our moral relations,—that in which we stand to our Creator. There is no denying this. The prescribed exercises and avowed ends of the institution are, in the very highest sense of the term, moral. But if the worship of God, or the expression of those sentiments and affections towards him which constitute inward devotion, be an incumbent moral duty, it is a duty, for the efficient fulfilment of which some stated seasons are of obvious utility. If, indeed, there is to be such a thing at all as *social* worship, in which men jointly recognise their common origin and dependence, and their obli-

gations to their one Maker and Benefactor, and thus cherish, on the highest ground, their mutual feelings of unity and love,—utility becomes too feeble a term; such stated seasons being evidently of imperious necessity. And the universal practice of mankind, even under the corruptest forms of false religion, seems to ascertain such social worship to be a dictate, either of the law of nature, or of original and traditionary revelation. If devoting a portion of our time to such purposes as the Sabbath is designed to promote, be a moral duty; then does it not, naturally and properly, belong to God to determine and fix the proportion? *Wardlaw*, pp. 76—79.

It has been the usual fault of divines, in expounding the Fourth Commandment, to dwell almost exclusively on the personal duty of observing the day religiously, and to say little or nothing of the relative duty of letting those dependent upon us rest as well as ourselves; by which means the Institution has been invested with a character of repulsive severity utterly foreign from its primary character. Nay, so completely has its true spirit been sometimes overlooked, that theologians have talked of the duty incumbent upon masters to *command* their servants to cease from labour, to *compel* them to rest on the Sabbath*; as if the blessed boon of the Creator required to be forced upon the labourer's acceptance! It is true, that the poor have been too ready to sell the Sabbath for a trifling gain; and that many seem to prefer any drudgery to the worship of their Creator. But with regard to the millions who toil at the pleasure of others, do they require to be forbidden to work when the respite is allowed them? Just as much as the ox needs be forbidden to drag the plough, and the ass to take up his burden on the Sabbath. The very reason given on the repetition of the law,—“Remember thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt” (Deut. v. 15.), ought to have precluded this most unhappy misapprehension of the character of the law, which so preposterously converts a prohibition to exact work and labour from others, into a mere personal restriction, or a command intended to bind all persons to certain observances! To whom is the law addressed, Thou shalt do thereon no manner of work? To the servant or the labourer? No, but to his master,—to him who works by other hands than his own,—to the farmer, the land-holder, the capitalist, the manufacturer, and the man of wealth, the interdict is addressed, which says, *Thou* shalt do no

* Thus, even the admirable Leighton mis-expounds the commandment. ‘As each one is obliged personally, so, they who have command of others, are *bound to bind them* to observance of the precept, and the cattle to rest!’ Nothing is said of not exacting labour from others! The law of mercy is exhibited as only a law of severity, not loosing the servant and the labourer from toil, but binding him with undefined restrictions.

work or business. Can there be any meaning in this, if it does not imply that they shall not command or require any servile labour on the sabbath; that they shall not let their work proceed; that they shall allow a respite to their meanest dependents, and even the very cattle?

It is only in this point of view, on the one hand, that the law of the Sabbath *can* be enforced by political authority; but on the other hand, viewed in this light, the duty of enforcing it becomes imperative. We are very happy to find Dr. Wardlaw announcing the following sentiments on the political obligation of the Sabbath, as those which he has long held.

‘It does not seem enough to say, that it is merely competent to human legislatures, to enact the cessation from labour on the seventh day;—the law of God, we apprehend, makes it incumbent upon them to do so. The law of the Sabbath, we have seen, was an original law of the Creator,—a law for mankind,—known from the beginning, and indicated by universal, though, in most cases, very obscure tradition. In conformity with such tradition, it comes out afresh in divine revelation, by which the primary institute was re-enacted. By this institute, there are allotted to men, six days of labour, and one of rest, in regular alternation. This day of rest, then, belongs to every man, by the law of God. It is property,—property to which there is a divinely guarantied title. No one man has a right to demand it of another. To exact labour on the day of rest, is as felonious a trespass against the law of God, as the abstraction, whether furtive or violent, of another man’s worldly substance. The fourth commandment secures property in time, as really as the eighth commandment secures property in money or lands. The rest of the seventh day is the birth-right possession of every human being. God has given it; and man may not take it away. When masters of servants, and owners of slaves, speak of *allowing* their servants and their slaves the Sunday to themselves, they speak the language of presumption. They cannot allow what they have no title to withhold. That time is not theirs. It belongs, by divine, and therefore inalienable prescription, to their dependents.—It is very true, that the time thus appropriated to man, each individual is, by the same law that appropriates it, bound to keep holy to God; using it, in accordance with the divine intention, for the purposes of devout commemoration of His doings, and the ascription of homage to His name. But this is the individual’s own concern. He sins against God, and wrongs his own soul, when he fails so to employ it, or alienates it to other occupations; but for this he is responsible, not to fellow-creatures, but to his Creator. His not using the day aright, no more entitles another to exact his labour on it, than a man’s not “honouring the Lord with his substance and with the first-fruits of all his increase,” warrants another to rob him of his property. We must answer to God for the use of our substance; but still it is our own:—we must answer to God for the use of our sabbatical time; but it is equally our own. Every man who knows that the Most High God has given such a law, has a right to claim this time; and no other man can exact it of him without felony against the statutes

of heaven.—If these things be so,—if there be a parity between the law which invests a man with property in his rightfully acquired substance, and the law which invests him with property in this proportion of his time,—does it not become more than competent to human legislators,—does it not become their incumbent and imperative duty, to guard from spoliation the one description of property as well as the other?—by statute and penalty to hinder the exaction of time, as well as the abstraction of goods?—to protect their subjects in the enjoyment and use of every one of their divinely guaranteed rights?—And, since the sabbatical law is dictated, on the part of Deity, by mercy to the brute creation as well as to men, ought not human enactments, in the same spirit of mercy, to provide, as far as possible, for the security of *their* rights also? Ought they not to maintain and enforce a law, so eminently beneficial to those dumb creatures of God, which he has subjected to the service of man, but which he has thus, at the same time, compassionately protected, by statute, from oppression and waste? ' *Wardlaw*, pp. 162—4.

Dr. Wardlaw's opinion will, we know, have with our readers, the weight it deserves: in a note, the learned Author cites from a work by his friend Mr. M'Gavin, a passage expressing coincident sentiments, which we also transcribe with pleasure.

' "We are thankful for the protection which the law of the land gives us in this respect; and we can be so, without conceding to the civil power the right of interference in matters of religion. It is the duty of the civil magistrate to enforce obedience to the law of God, not in relation to religious worship, but in all matters which relate to right and property between man and man. Some define the magistrate's power to relate to the second table of the law only; but this is not quite correct. There is one command of the second table, namely, the tenth, which he cannot enforce, because it relates to the thoughts of the heart;—and there is a part of the first table which he can, and ought to enforce, because it relates to a matter of property and right between man and man. The eighth commandment gives to every man a right to his own property; and the fourth commandment gives to every man, especially to servants, and even to labouring cattle, a right, to one day in seven, to rest from the service of their masters;—and it is as much the duty of the civil power to protect them in this right, which can be done only by an authoritative suspension of worldly business on that day, as to protect the property and lives of the subjects generally. On this ground, and this only, I consider the rest of the Sabbath a proper subject of human legislation." ' *Ib.* p. 165.

This was the ground we took in contending, that it is the duty of the civil government ' to provide, that all persons shall on the ' Lord's Day have the *liberty, means* and *opportunity* of applying themselves to the religious observation of the day '*; or, in other words, ' to secure the benefit of the Institution to all classes

* Ecl. Rev. Vol. IV. p. 336. *Law of the Sabbath*, p. 40.

‘ of the community.’ In holding this language, we may perhaps be thought to differ from Dr. Wardlaw, who, distinguishing between ‘ the two classes of ends intended to be answered by the ‘ Sabbath, the secular and the spiritual,’ lays down the principle; ‘ that human laws, while they may not interfere with the latter, ‘ and never do interfere but prejudicially, may and ought to regulate and enforce the former.’

‘ Upon the ground of the distinction referred to,’ continues Dr. W., ‘ I have no hesitation in calling for the execution of such existing laws as have reference to the secularities and political ends of the Sabbath; and for the enactment of new ones, if the old are found impracticable or inefficient. I am aware of the delicacy of my ground. I am aware how apt magistrates may be, even from good principles and well-intentioned zeal, to go beyond their limits, and out of their sphere. And the difficulties of the case have been multiplied, by that intermingling of civil and sacred, of political and religious, which, on this and other subjects, has unavoidably arisen from the meretricious union of church and state. But still, our aversion, on New Testament principles, to this union, should not be allowed to blind and pervert our judgements, and carry us away to the opposite extreme. We must not allow ourselves to forget, that, although the principal ends of the Sabbath are spiritual, there are those which are subordinate and secular; that these are not to be overlooked; and that it is to the attainment of these that the statutes and penalties of human legislation should be directed. To this they are competent; to this they are obliged; but by this they ought to be limited. There must be no legal requisition and enforcement of a certain measure of attendance on divine worship; far less of attendance at prescribed places. The worship of God, being a purely religious service, must be entirely voluntary, the dictate of principle and of pious disposition; and is quite beyond the province of any authority beneath the Supreme. Neither must there be any interference with the private and domestic modes of spending the day. Be they ever so inconsistent with its spiritual nature and ends,—ever so much opposed, in this respect, to the mind and will of Him by whom “the Sabbath was made for man,”—there must be no vexatious system of domiciliary visitation and inquisitorial *espionage*,—no harassing encroachment on the privacies of life,—no interference with any mode of passing the time, that does not disturb public peace, or trespass on public decorum. If compulsion cannot, on any right principle, be applied to the public duties of religion, still less can it to those which are personal and domestic.’ *Wardlaw*, pp. 269—71.

With these excellent sentiments, our own are in entire unison. The only difference between the much respected Author and ourselves, lies, we apprehend, in the mode of defining the distinct province and duty of the Legislature. Dr. Wardlaw thinks, that only the secular ends of the Sabbath can be reached, or ought to be referred to, by human laws. We should prefer to say, the secular observance only of the Sabbath can be enforced

by the civil magistracy ; but even the political benefits of the Sabbath are inseparably connected with its highest ends. The legislator is not required to shut his eyes to the broad fact, that it is for the interest of the State, that men should be religious ; and he must know, or ought to know, that the Sabbath has been given by the Creator for religious ends, and has ever been the bulwark of religion. He must be aware too, that only in proportion as the ultimate, spiritual ends of the Sabbath are attained by the devout observance of the day, the moral advantages and secular benefits of the Institution to the community are likely to be realized. Thus, as a politician, he has a direct interest in the day's being religiously observed. Without going out of his sphere, then, he may and ought to have regard to those spiritual ends of the Institution. For instance, if he closes the theatre on the Sabbath, it is not in order to promote the secular ends of the Sabbath, but to prevent its sanctity from desecration ; and in interfering ' for the protection from all unnecessary interruption and ' annoyance of those who choose to devote the day to its more appropriate end',—which is confessedly his province,—he still must have his eyes open to the spiritual ends for which the Sabbath has been instituted. We can have no objection to the position, that the *department* of the magistrate is purely secular ; and this is, we believe, all that Dr. Wardlaw intends. His department is, the protection of men's personal rights and social interests, civil and religious. Civil protection may be considered as a secular end ; and it is as a *law of protection*, that the Sabbath claims to be politically enforced. But, in protecting men in their religious rights and privileges, the magistrate is directly promoting in the best possible way, the cause of religion and morality ; and it is surely desirable that this should be his aim and intention. With a writer in the *North American Review*, we join in expressing the conviction, ' that the people of the United States '—of this—of any country—' have nothing better, in regard to their political concerns, to hope or wish for, than that ' all their agents ' (and rulers) ' should be influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief.'* And in the language of the Report of the General Union for promoting the Sabbath in the United States, we will add : ' We trust that the

* ' This would not bring about', adds the American Reviewer, ' as the writer alluded to supposes, without apparently attaching any very distinct meaning to the terms, *a union of Church and State* ; but it would procure us the blessing of Providence,—a wise, liberal, efficient, and, above all, honest administration of the government in all its branches,—a condition of general and constantly progressive prosperity,—and, to sum up all in one word, peace.' *North American Review*, No. LXVIII. Art. *On Sunday Mails*.

‘improved moral sense of the nation, sanctified by the influences
‘of Christianity, will yet exert a benign influence in the national
‘councils, leading our legislators to believe, that the permanency
‘of our invaluable institutions, and the stability of our laws, de-
‘pend upon a solemn recognition and devout observance of the
‘laws of that great Being who was our fathers’ God, and who will
‘be the God of our posterity, until they shall voluntarily throw
‘off all allegiance to him.’

We recur then to our original positions; that the religious obligation of observing the Sabbath, is a proper reason for politically protecting it from desecration;—that the moral obligation may be properly assumed as the basis of the political enactments;—and that, although the religious observance of the day cannot be compelled, the interests of the community require that every facility should be afforded by the civil magistrate for its universal observance, so that all classes may have the opportunity of applying themselves to the observation of the day by exercising themselves in the duties of religion. It has been very properly said: ‘There is a wide difference between compelling a man to go
‘to church, and preventing him from going to market: he does
‘not injure his neighbour by absenting himself from church or
‘chapel; but, if he goes to market, he is infringing on the rights
‘of another, which rights it is the duty of the magistrate to main-
‘tain inviolate.’* This is a sufficient answer to the despicable cant which pleads the rights of conscience in favour of the mercenary breach of the sacred compact. But the reason that the law prevents a man from going to market, is, that the allowing it would prevent many from going to church. Those alone would be *wronged* by the opening of the market, who religiously abstained from attending it; but those would be still more *injured*, who suffered no direct infringement of their rights, but were induced to disregard the Sabbath. Now we conceive, that the prevention of this injury, by cutting off the temptation and barring the opportunity of the crime, falls as much within the province of the Legislature, as the protection of the religious man from being wronged. Political expediency requires, not only that the religious should be protected in their secular interests, but that the irreligious should be so far protected in their moral interests, as that they should not of necessity grow up in vice, ignorance, and profaneness, through the licensed desecration of the only day of religious instruction. If the civil government allows the lower classes to be deprived of the only means and opportunity of paying regard to the ordinances of religion, although they may not be *forcibly* deprived, although they may be criminally parties to

* Patriot Newspaper, March 22.

their own wrong, in yielding to the inducements held out to them,—the Government is answerable for the consequences to society, of suffering the day of rest to be so far, in practice, abolished; and those consequences will assuredly become visible and palpable in the returns of pauperism and crime. Whether Sabbath-breaking be admitted to be a national crime or not, whether it be a moral wrong or not, whether it be a legal offence or not, it is undeniably the prolific parent of crime, from the corruption of morals which, as Blackstone remarks, follows the profanation of the day. As a matter of sordid calculation, it would be found *economical* to check the growth of irreligion and profaneness, by this simple method of prevention,—enforcing the observance of the Lord's Day. All that the Government can do, it is bound to do, by every moral obligation that can attach to Christian rulers, and every political consideration that ought to govern enlightened statesmen. Government cannot compel men to be devout, to be conscientious, or to worship God; and in compelling them to attend the services of religion, it would not merely be infringing upon the principles of religious liberty, but be compelling and fostering that hypocrisy which is itself a crime. But Government can close the market, and throw open the church; can lay an arrest upon the wheels of traffic, and secure to all the leisure for religious instruction; can set the example of honouring the sanctity of the day; can recognise the religious obligation of devoting it to religious purposes; can interpose between the master and the slave, so as to secure to the latter his only property, the time which God has given him for his own; and can, by so doing, become to the country “the minister of God for good”.* The refusal of the civil power to do this, we do not hesitate to express our deep conviction, will involve us in the guilt of a national crime, which, as surely as there is a Supreme Moral Governor, shall entail upon us national punishment.

The length to which this article has already extended, will render it necessary to take very brief notice of the subsequent sections of the volume which has elicited these remarks. In Section II., the Writer examines ‘the supposed transference of the ‘weekly Sabbath from the Jewish to the Christian economy’; and in Section III., the ‘Scriptural evidence’ is further considered, for the purpose of being explained away, by a process similar to that by which the Socinian proves that there is no Scriptural evidence for the divinity of Christ, the atonement, or any other doctrine opposed to his sentiments. Having, on a former occasion, gone over this branch of the inquiry, we do not feel ourselves called upon to attempt the formal refutation of the

* Rom. xiii. 4.

Writer's reasonings; more especially as he has taken no notice of the ample and satisfactory answer that most of his arguments and objections have received, and has misstated in many instances the opinions he controverts. As a specimen of his logical tactics, we may refer to the flippant manner in which the fact of the original institution of the Sabbath, as recorded Gen. ii. 3., is disposed of. 'A greater importance has been attached to this part of the question', he says, 'than properly belongs to it.'

'It is no doubt recorded, that God rested from his works on the seventh day; but it is to be remembered, that it is the precepts, and not the example of God, which constitute the rule of human duty.'

A more flagrant specimen of unfair dealing with Scripture evidence, could hardly be selected from the works of any papist or neologist. Is nothing *more* recorded, than that God rested from his works on the seventh day? Is his blessing and sanctifying the seventh day nothing? Is this recorded for nothing? Is not the example of God in resting on the seventh day, elsewhere adduced as a reason for the precept to rest on the sabbath? It is, however, an assertion in flat opposition to the most explicit language of the New Testament, that the example of God is not a rule of human duty.* A writer who can allow himself to deal in such bold and random affirmations, is not to be trusted as a reasoner; and the freedom with which he imputes to all from whom he differs, gratuitous assertions, preposterous opinions, mere assumptions, an entire forgetfulness of obvious facts, ill becomes the modest inquirer after truth.

We cannot pass over the gross misrepresentation of the Saviour's conduct, in working miracles of healing on the Sabbath, which occurs at p. 261. To evade the natural inference, that Our Lord designed to teach the Jews that the Sabbath was made for the benefit of man, and to reprove the sanctimonious hypocrisy of the Pharisees, the Writer represents his conduct as *an intentional violation of the law*, in virtue of his authority as Messiah; a public and avowed violation of the Sabbath. It can scarcely be necessary to refute this most abominable perversion of Scripture, which would justify the Pharisees for treating Our Lord as a blasphemer, making him to have committed a legal crime. If any possible doubt could exist as to the entire lawfulness (according to the law of Moses) of the acts which Our Lord performed on the Sabbath, from their very nature, his own language would remove it: "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath-days, or to "do evil?"† Nay, his very accusers were put to shame, when

* See Matt. v. 45—48. Eph. v. 1. 1 Pet. i. 15. 1 John iv. 11.

† Mark iii. 4. See also Matt. xii. 7.—"Ye would not have condemned the *guiltless*."

he appealed to their own construction of the law: "Thou hypocrite! doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo! these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?"* We must say that, pernicious as is the conclusion which our Author labours to establish, the arguments which he employs are still worse, and are of a character that betrays the infatuation of error.

One more specimen. At page 186, the Writer asserts, that 'the two great commandments, the love of God and of our neighbour, are not directly propounded in the Decalogue;' that they comprehend the Decalogue, but are not comprehended in it; and that 'the assumption that the moral law is comprehended in the Ten Commandments, seems to be alike incorrect and unfounded.' Thus, first setting up his own perverse exposition of the Decalogue in opposition to that of Christ and his apostles, he would persuade us to throw away the whole Ten Commandments as a mere fragment of an abrogated Jewish code; boldly denouncing 'the modern practice of dragging the Decalogue from its natural situation in the old covenant of Moses,' as 'the relic of an ignorant age,' credulously retained without the slightest shadow of evidence!

Passing over the unwarrantable arrogance of such language, worthy only of the heretical doctrine which it is employed to bolster up, before we dismiss the volume, we would seriously conjure the Writer to reflect upon the awful predicament in which he will find himself, should he, after all, be mistaken. What if the law which he ridicules and misrepresents, which he has exerted himself to the utmost to undermine, which he would erase with more than iconoclastic zeal from the walls of every Christian sanctuary, be *not* abrogated? Let him not deceive himself with the fond notion that he is under the protection of Scripture. He stands purely upon his own infallibility, contradicting the great body of the pious in every age, and risking, on the chance of being right in his opinion, the awful condemnation: "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." True; he has Archbishop Whately and Peter Heylin on his side; and he may cite a few incautious expressions of some of the Reformers, when scarcely emerged from the darkness of popery. But the great body of those whose interests he has espoused in this volume, are of a less respectable character, consisting of the anti-puritan, the antinomian, the sabbath-breaker, the scoffer, and

* Luke xiii. 15—17. See on this very point, Mr. Wilson's Sermons on the Lord's Day, pp. 61—68.

the profane. However pure may be a man's intentions, however sincere and deliberate his convictions, it might well startle him to find himself ranged on the same side of an argument with men whose opinions are dictated by their corrupt passions, and aiding them in trampling under foot even a *supposed* law of God. The law of the Sabbath, considered as a law of expediency, he admits to be just and good; and he has therefore no excuse for having published a volume which, under the pretence of demolishing a theological dogma, aims at extirpating a Divine precept from the conscience, and subverting that law which Paul gloried in establishing. We can assure him that it is with unfeigned regret, and under a paramount sense of duty, we have been led to express such an opinion of the character and tendency of his performance.

We had intended to give some further extracts from the various excellent publications mentioned at the head of this article. Mr. Wilson's Sermons are distinguished by their practical value, combining with a very complete view of the theological argument in support of the perpetual obligation of the day, an earnest enforcement of its religious duties, and a faithful remonstrance with the habitual violators of the Sabbath, of every class. Dr. Wardlaw's volume is of a more argumentative character, and embraces, as will have been seen, a particular examination of the question relating to its legislative enforcement. Dr. Burder's Four Lectures present with great perspicuity and conciseness the outlines of the argument, in a form adapted for popular circulation: the subjects are, the Law of the Sabbath as instituted at the Creation;—as contained in the Decalogue; the change of the day; the due observance of the Sabbath. Mr. Gurney's Brief Remarks are arranged under the following chapters: 1. On the Patriarchal Sabbath. 2. On the Mosaic Sabbath. 3. On the Jewish Sabbath at the Christian era. 4. On the Christian Sabbath. Like every thing which proceeds from the Author's pen, it displays solid erudition and acute reasoning, united to true simplicity of mind and fervent piety. Though not adapted to silence a caviller, it will afford ample satisfaction to any one who wishes to have a concise view of the historical and ecclesiastical, as well as Scriptural evidence for the authority of the day. The fact cited by Mr. Gurney, after Bishop Andrews, from the Acts of the Martyrs, if it may be relied on, is decisive as to the practice of the early Christians; especially in connexion with the well-known testimonies of Pliny and Justin Martyr. Referring to the words used by Pliny, Mr. Gurney puts the question, 'But what was the *stated day* when these things took place?'

'Clearly the first day of the week; as is proved by the very question which it was customary for the Roman persecutors to address to the martyrs—*Dominicum servasti?*—Hast thou kept the Lord's Day?

To which the answer usually returned was in substance: *Christianus sum: intermittere non possum.*—I am a Christian: I cannot omit it.'

Mr. Macfarlan's volume is more particularly designed for northern readers. The argumentative part is not distinguished by any peculiar originality or force; but in the Appendix will be found some valuable information as to the state of the law and of the practice relative to the Sabbath, in Scotland. Mr. Davies's volume embraces other topics besides the Sabbath, and well deserves a more extended notice than we can now bestow upon it. We did not like to pass it over, however, in enumerating the works recently published on the general subject of this article; which must be our apology for treating it thus summarily. The volume is divided into four parts, embracing the following subjects. I. The Ordinance of Divine Worship. II. The Ordinance of the Sabbath. III. The Ordinance of Baptism. IV. The Ordinance of the Lord's Supper. These are treated in a manner the reverse of dry didactic discussion or polemical theology. We seem, in accompanying the Writer, to have escaped into a milder and more genial atmosphere. A glow of feeling and piety lightens up his pages, imparting occasionally a floridness to the style, not unpleasing, because it appears to be the native dress of the Author's thoughts. But the highest merit of the volume lies in the judicious and scriptural instruction which it conveys, and its adaptation to practical usefulness. We have wished to find a paragraph or two that may at once serve as a fair specimen of the work, and as an appropriate conclusion to the present article; and the following extract seems to recommend itself for our purpose.

'It is another most important benefit connected with the due observance of the Sabbath, that it is the most effectual *preservative* against being overwhelmed by the engrossing cares and interests of the present world. Who that has made the attempt,—who that is capable of appreciating the nature of this arduous conflict, has not felt the difficulty of the struggle? Who is not aware of the distracting influence of secular anxieties and pursuits, when they are allowed to take exclusive possession of the mind? Who knows not the intense continuity of emotion, with which the various enterprises of gain, ambition, and professional occupation are apt to harass and enthrall the breast? Who that has been brought within the circle of its enchantment, has not felt the fascinations of worldly pleasure and amusement? These, in confederacy with the inherent tendencies and susceptibilities of corrupt nature, are the enemies which war against the soul. They press upon it from every side with a constancy and pertinacity of assault, with a variety and an amount of force, which, if it had been left exposed to their uninterrupted violence, would inevitably effect its destruction. The principles of religion, like the seed sown among thorns, or scattered by the way-side, would either be choked by the

multiplicity of cares, and trials, and vexations, or be dissipated by the levity and impetuosity of encroaching lusts and passions.

‘The Sabbath was provided and appointed by divine wisdom—that wisdom which well knew what was in man, to be a place of seclusion and retreat, to which the soul might betake itself every seventh day, for the purpose of recruiting its strength, and of repairing its wasted energies, after conflicting in unequal contest with the perturbations and disquietudes, the cares and interests, the pleasures and dissipations of the world. On this day, a truce has been imposed by the high authority of heaven, upon the more direct warfare which that great enemy, in its various forms of business and pleasure, carries on against the soul. It is a holy league stipulated in our favour for the express purpose of affording us convenient opportunity of carrying on, unmolested by the encroachments of worldly care or occupation, our intercourse with our Father who is in heaven. And when the object of the institution is duly realised and appreciated, the effect is transcendently glorious and beneficial, and the end is fully accomplished. It is indeed difficult to estimate too highly the soothing and tranquillizing influence of a sabbath, upon a spirit which has been worn in the service of the world during the preceding week, into comparative numbness and insensibility to the pure and delicate enjoyments of an exalted fellowship with God. It is delightful to contemplate it amidst the serenity of the surrounding atmosphere, composing its ruffled affections, and, like the bird of the morning, preparing to rise on its pinions, in order to meet in midway fellowship the hallowed choir above, and to pour forth its notes of praise and thanksgiving, while no jarring tumult of worldly business or delight intervenes to break their melody. On every seventh day, the impetus of earthly and carnalizing pursuits thus receives a check, and their power becomes in some degree enfeebled. The course of this world, which is so apt to carry us along in its turbid and destructive movement, is broken at intervals; which affords us time to reflect upon the peril of our condition, and to contemplate the dreadful gulf to which it conducts. By the periodical cessation from other employments, which the sabbath brings round, we are impressively reminded, that there is another and a better world, that there are higher and weightier interests, that there are purer and more substantial joys than the present scene affords, that ere long, time will be swallowed up in eternity, and that we shall be surrounded with realities of happiness, or woe, which will render all sublunary sorrows and delights as insignificant as the bubbles upon the stream.

‘The benefits of the Sabbath, when strictly and devoutly observed, are however not confined to the powerful influence which it exerts in obviating the various evils attendant on habits of indolence and worldly occupation; they are of a more direct and positive character. And among this latter class we may remark, that this sacred institution is calculated to be eminently beneficial in forming habits of general *Propriety, Regularity, and Virtue*. That these habits of conduct are in themselves highly advantageous to individuals, as well as to the community at large, requires no proof. They are obviously the bonds of society, and the purest and most copious sources of domestic peace and comfort. Their connection with the observance of the sabbath, and

with the discharge of its appropriate duties, though not so palpable and apparent, is yet certain and unquestionable. A feeling of reverence and respect for the holy day of God, may be fairly asserted to be a moral principle of the most influential and practical character. It is a germ of thought and feeling pregnant with the most extensive and salutary results. It is a spring of action which has a powerful effect in controlling and regulating the movements of the whole machinery of the conduct. There is in fact, no external ordinance of religion, which experience shews to be so intimately connected with correspondent effects upon the general character, as that of the sabbath. Few habits are so truly symptomatic of the real state of the mind, as the mode in which it is habitually employed. Fix your eye upon any individual of your neighbourhood, or acquaintance in any department of life, who is remarkable for his conscientious regard for the sabbath, and for his regular and uniform attendance upon the public services of the sanctuary, and I am most exceedingly mistaken if you do not find him equally distinguished, if not by the genuineness of his piety and the fervour of his devotion, at least by the decency, the industry, and the rectitude of his general demeanour. Look around you on the other hand, and mark the man who is noted for his desecration of the day, which is by pre-eminence "the holy of the Lord",—the man who spends it in sleep, or in work, in travelling, or yawning, in drinking or gambling,—the man who is rarely, if ever, found at his church, or his chapel, and still more infrequently at his Bible or his devotions; and what are his prevailing habits during the other days of the week? Granted—that he is not very precise in the duties which he owes to God; but is he more exact and conscientious in those which immediately relate to man? Is it to him that you would look for a pattern of every social and domestic virtue, of honour, benevolence, and integrity, as a man of property or professional engagement, of rectitude, veracity, and assiduity as a tradesman, of industry and conscientiousness as a workman, of fidelity as a servant, of sobriety and diligence as the head or the subordinate member of a family, of kindness as a husband, of affection and prudence as a parent, or of dutifulness and obedience as a child? To look for such qualities in combination with gross sabbath-profanation, and with habitual neglect and contempt of the appointed ordinances of the sanctuary, would obviously be to seek for light in darkness, virtue in vice, life in death. It is true indeed, that pride, necessity, or self-interest may do much to cleanse the exterior of the character, and to restrain the grosser excesses of profligacy and indolence; but no means are more effectual in raising the general standard of morality, and in removing the deformities of individual conduct, than the enlightened observance of the sabbath. I should deem it a most important step in advance, therefore, in parochial reformation, as a component part of national virtue, if every individual could be persuaded to pay a decent respect to the sabbath, and to be regular in his attendance upon the public means of grace. Such persons, I should consider not far from the kingdom of God; and though it be indispensably necessary to enter into the spirit, as well as to perform the outward duties of religion, yet, much moral benefit may be gained in improved habits of domestic and relative conduct, where un-

happily there is danger the most awful and imminent, of coming short of the great salvation. It is impossible that a man of notoriously depraved and dissolute character should regularly meet his friends, or at least his neighbours, in the house of God, without feeling the dreadful inconsistency of his conduct. He will stand abashed in the presence of God and the congregation, and it can scarcely be otherwise, than that he should either be induced to forsake his vices, or abandon the place; where he appears from sabbath to sabbath, clad, as it were, in a robe of white, proclaiming his own shame. The indirect influence of the sabbath and its various ordinances, in thus purifying the outer court of the human character, even where it hath not the effect of consecrating its inner shrine, is, I am persuaded, incalculably beneficial to the community.' pp. 146—51.

Art. II. *The Eighth Report of the Committee of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline, and for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders.* 1832. With an Appendix. 8vo. pp. xvi. 320. Price 6s. London, 1832.

THE Seventh Report of the Committee of this admirable Society was published in 1827, and was reviewed in the last Volume of our former series. The present Report was (in substance) submitted to the General Meeting of the Society held at Exeter Hall, in the month of May last. The delay of its appearance is sufficiently explained by the immense mass of statistical and other valuable information, which forms the Appendix to the Report. While it was passing through the press, the population returns for 1831 have been printed by order of the House of Commons; of which use has been made to correct the calculations of the relative proportion of the number of criminal offenders throughout the country. The results are, upon the whole, more favourable than might have been anticipated.

Although the number of criminal offenders committed in the year 1830, was greater in particular districts, the aggregate number of commitments throughout England and Wales was less than in the preceding year. The total numbers were, in 1829, 18,675; in 1830, 18,107. The number of convictions had also decreased within the same period from 13,261, to 12,805. These numbers do not include offenders of every description who pass through the prisons during the year, but such only as were committed for trial at the assizes and quarter sessions; exclusive of debtors, vagrants, prisoners for re-examination, and summary convictions before magistrates. It was stated, at the general meeting, that, on a moderate computation, there are annually confined in the several gaols and houses of correction in the United Kingdom, a population of not less than 120,000 persons. This would be a two hundredth part of the aggregate population. The estimate

must, we think, be an exaggeration. The amount of actual crime which the returns indicate, is sufficiently appalling; but what renders it still more affecting, is the consideration of the crime, or at least the moral depravation which is thus generated. If, by an efficient prison discipline, there is reason to rejoice that the vicious have sometimes been reclaimed, there are too many instances of those who have been first tainted and debased by imprisonment, to which they have been subjected for a first, perhaps a slight, perhaps only a suspected, offence. Of the numbers committed on the charge of criminal offences, the proportion is very great, who are either not prosecuted or acquitted; and while it would be idle to suppose that the latter, although innocent in law, are always innocent in fact, or morally guiltless of the charge laid against them, (since their acquittal in, perhaps, a majority of cases, is owing simply to a deficiency of evidence, or to some technical flaw in the proceedings,) still, there will remain, after all reasonable deductions, a very large number of persons committed to prison,—and thereby punished upon presumption before trial,—and exposed to all the contamination and degradation of a gaol, upon unfounded charges.

Out of the 18,675 persons committed in 1829, only 13,261 were convicted; 1800 were not prosecuted, no bills being found; and 3614 were acquitted: that is to say, against 5,414 out of 18,675, no criminal charge could be sustained. The proportion is enormous; and one inference which it suggests, is, that the labours of such a society as the one whose report is before us, are of an importance almost incalculable. ‘Upon the nature of the discipline to which such prisoners are subjected, it depends,’ to adopt the language of the first Resolution of the General Meeting, ‘whether those who are innocent of crime, shall be corrupted and debased by their confinement, and the convicted rendered still further guilty; or whether imprisonment shall be made instrumental in preserving the untried from contamination, in correcting and reforming the convicted, and in deterring generally from the commission of crime. An efficient system of prison discipline is therefore of great importance to the public security, and the moral welfare of the nation.’

We have stated, that the results of the criminal reports are, upon the whole, though sufficiently appalling, less so than might have been anticipated. This, however, will require both explanation and qualification, for the increase of crime is undeniable. In the year 1821, the total number of commitments in England and Wales was 13,115; in 1830, 18,107. A frightful increase! The population in 1821, stood at 11,978,975; it is now, 13,894,574; so that the relative increase of crime, in proportion to that of the population, is about 5000 to two millions. On looking back to the returns of the last twelve years, there will be

found a progressive rise in the number of crimes, with the exception of the years 1822 and 1823, which exhibit fewer commitments, by nearly 1000, than 1821, and about 1500 below 1824; and with the further exception of 1828, which was below either the preceding or the succeeding year. On the other hand, when we look at the nature of the criminal charges, there is some ground for a mitigation of the feeling of alarm. The number of commitments for murder in 1821, was 71; in 1822, 85; in 1825, 94; in 1828, 83; and in 1829, only 47.* In the latter year, however, the commitments for stabbing, shooting, &c., were very much above the average: they were, in 1821, 60; in 1826, 47; in 1828, 72; and in 1829, 115. The commitments for manslaughter in 1821, were 101; in 1829, 125. If we turn to burglary, we shall find a remarkable decrease of that particular crime. The average of the years 1820 to 1826 inclusive, is about 460; in 1827, the commitments for this offence were 572; but in 1828, they were only 249; and in 1829, 171. In other crimes of violence, there is no very decided increase; but in simple larceny, we have the following progression.

1820	1825	1827	1828	1829
9160.	10,087.	12,014.	10,989.	12,628.

So that, of the increase of crime, one half consists of offences of simple larceny; and of the other half, a very large proportion consists of larceny under particular modifications. The commitments for offences against the Game-laws were, in 1821, 199; in 1823, 223; in 1828, 366; of whom 60 were acquitted or discharged. The average number of persons executed in the seven years from 1823 to 1829 inclusive, was 62; the lowest number being 49, and the highest (in 1828) 79. But in 1820, they were 107; and in 1821, 114. The average number condemned to death in the seven years, was 1192; the lowest number being 968, and the highest (in 1827) 1526. The number sentenced to death in 1830, was 1397, being a proportion of one ninth of the whole number convicted, and one thirteenth of those who were committed. But of those who were thus formally adjudged to suffer the extreme penalty of the law, only 1 in 30 underwent the sen-

* The progressive diminution in number, of crimes of an atrocious description, during the rapid increase of population in this country, is, indeed, highly remarkable. From documents laid before the House of Commons, it appears that the number of convictions and executions for murder, within the Home Circuit, at three separate periods, was as follows:

	CONVICTED.	EXECUTED.
From 1688 to 1718	123	87
1755 to 1784	67	57
1784 to 1814	54	44
	L L 2	

tence. 'Such,' remark the Committee, 'is the discrepancy between 'the sentence of the law and its execution.' The following remarks on the nature and causes of the prevailing description of offences are highly deserving of attention.

'In the criminal commitments for the last year, the number of crimes against the person was 870, being a proportion of 1 in 21 of the whole number committed: the remainder were for crimes against property. The number of *convictions* for offences against the person, was 432, being only 1 in 30 of the whole convicted. The number sentenced to death for crimes against the person, was 227; being 1 in 6 of the whole so sentenced; but the number who suffered death for that offence, was 27; being rather more than one half of the total number executed. The majority of crimes against property for which offenders were sentenced capitally, but of whom only a small proportion, and in some cases none, were executed, may be classed under the following heads: viz.

	Sentenced to death.	Executed.
For burglary	104	2
For breaking into dwelling-houses, &c.	527	6
For larceny in a dwelling-house .	100	2
For sheep-stealing	213	1
For horse-stealing	139	0
For cattle-stealing	25	0
	<hr/> 1108	<hr/> 11

'These facts, taken in connexion with the increase in the number of capital convictions, strengthen the opinion, that the chance of ultimately escaping the extreme punishment awarded by the law, affords powerful encouragement to the commission of crime.

'The lowness of wages, and prevalence of distress arising from redundancy of population, are unquestionably the main sources of criminal offence; causes greatly aggravated by others connected with the general condition of the labouring classes. Of these, the most prominent are,—the absence of moral and religious education among the great mass of the labouring population; the perverted application of parochial relief; and especially of late, *the enormous abuse of spirituous liquors*. These evils present to the poor of this country, temptations to crime too powerful to be counteracted by the ordinary institutions of penal justice. *Much, however, of the apparent increase in the number of commitments to prison, arises from other causes than those connected with the advance of crime.* Offences which were formerly either passed over, or visited with summary correction, are now made the occasion of commitment to gaol. The Malicious Trespass Act, as also the law for paying prosecutors their expenses in cases of misdemeanour, and other enactments, have tended to fill the prisons without any positive increase of crime. It is certain, that the number of atrocious offences has not increased in proportion to the population, and that with the advancement of civilization the darker crimes have been less apparent.'

Some consolation may be derived from these circumstances; and at the same time, some important suggestions. The increased frequency of unnecessary commitments is a most serious evil. We have already referred to the large proportion which the number of persons discharged by grand juries, or acquitted, bears to the whole number committed, and which is a pretty clear proof of the unsoundness of the present system. The magistrates are partly to blame, in being far more ready to commit a prisoner, than to accept of bail. 'There cannot be a question', say the Committee, 'that the number of untried prisoners—the most unmanageable class—might, by the general acceptance of bail, be reduced to one half, or even a third, with no injury to the community, with great benefit to the individual, and with material advantage to the discipline of prisons.' We know not whether any difference is made in practice, or can be made, in admitting bail, when the charge is for a *first* offence. It is obvious, however, that the risk of bailing is less, and the hardship of imprisonment for mere security much greater, when the person charged has never before been obnoxious to the law, than in the case of a second offence. Another circumstance which has swelled the number of commitments is, that cases of petty felonies, such as stealing hedge-stakes, and other articles of trifling value, are now, more frequently than heretofore, brought to trial. The number of prosecutions has also been greatly increased by the associations for mutual protection, established in all parts of the country, which preclude any reluctance to prosecute arising from the dread of expense.

'Formerly, if a boy was found committing such offences, he was personally chastised and discharged: now, there is a solemn judicial investigation. He is seized, committed, imprisoned, tried at the sessions, and convicted with as much form and ceremony as if he had been guilty of a burglary. This disposition (on the part of the magistrates) to avoid responsibility, fills the gaols in another manner. The sessions-calendars in the country exhibit a list of the pettiest offences. If, in addition to these, the magistrates were to try, as they do in several counties, some of the graver cases now reserved for the assizes, the labour of the judges would be spared, and the number of prisoners most materially diminished.'

For some of the sore burdens and evils which have been brought upon the country by the acts and decrees of the unpaid and irresponsible magistracy, we have to blame, not their intentions, which have generally been good, so much as, in many cases, their want of moral courage, their fear of doing wrong, and a timid adherence to rule; combined, no doubt, with a wish to escape from responsibility, and from the contingencies of future inconvenience, as well as to save themselves present trouble. To avoid exercising their discretionary power in a way which would involve responsibility, they have had recourse, too generally, to what may be

characterised as the indiscretional use of their discretion, in the extreme practice of commitment; the most dangerous power which could, under such circumstances, have been reposed in their hands. Nothing is more easy, in general, than to get an offender committed; nothing more difficult, troublesome, expensive, and uncertain, than to obtain the conviction of the culprit. If the case were the reverse,—if the chief difficulties in the way of prosecution were prior to commitment, and the conviction followed with a greater degree of certitude, the interests of justice and the welfare of society would be far more effectually promoted. The time is not, we apprehend, far distant, when a stipendiary magistracy will be found the most economical, as well as the most effective and trustworthy instrumentality for administering the laws, even in country districts.

In examining the relative proportion of crimes committed in different counties, it is found, that throughout the home counties, as well as in the manufacturing districts where the inhabitants are congregated in large bodies, the number of criminal offenders is greater. In the agricultural districts also, where distress has prevailed to a considerable extent, the proportion has been large. The number of criminals committed during the last year, throughout England, has been in the proportion of 1 to 740 inhabitants; in Wales, 1 to 2320; in Scotland, 1 to 1130; and in Ireland, 1 to 490. In London and Middlesex, the proportion of commitments has been higher than in any other county in England, being 1 criminal to 400 inhabitants. In Surrey, the proportion is 1 to 680; in Kent, 1 to 730; in Sussex, 1 to 750; in Essex, 1 to 650; in Hertfordshire, 1 to 520; in Bedfordshire, 1 to 710. In the manufacturing districts, the proportion is, in Lancashire, 1 to 650; in Warwickshire, 1 to 480; in Gloucestershire (including Bristol), 1 to 540; in Nottinghamshire, 1 to 750; in Cheshire, 1 to 630. In the more remote counties, the proportion is small; that of Northumberland being only 1 to 2700; in Westmoreland, 1 to 2500; in Durham, 1 to 2460; and in Cornwall, 1 to 1600. In Rutland also, the proportion is very much smaller than in the adjacent counties. In Wales, the highest proportion of offenders is found in the most populous county, Glamorgan; while Cardigan presents the lowest proportion of crime in any county of the United Kingdom, being only 1 to 4920. In the large manufacturing counties of Scotland, the proportion is nearly as high as in England: in Edinburgh, it is 1 to 540; in Lanark, the most populous county, 1 to 600. In Ireland, the highest proportion of crime is in the city of Dublin, where there has been one criminal to 96 inhabitants: in the city of Waterford, the proportion is 1 to 125. Of the counties in Ireland, that which has the largest proportion is Longford, being 1 to 260: the lowest proportion is in Downshire, which has only 1 criminal to 990 inhabitants. Of the total number of persons

convicted in Ireland, viz. 9902, only 262 were sentenced to death; and of these, 95 were for offences against the person: of the 262 sentenced to death, 39 suffered.

In inferring from the proportion of commitments in different counties, the degree of immorality and lawlessness which prevails, we cannot be altogether wrong. Yet, it is necessary to bear in mind what has already been stated, that the apparent increase in the number of commitments, and consequently the greater proportion in some counties, may be attributable to other causes than those connected with the advance of crime;—to the greater efficiency of the police,—to the increased facilities for detecting and prosecuting offenders,—to the state of public feeling with regard to petty offences,—to the readiness of the magistrates to commit for such misdemeanours as were formerly passed over or visited with summary correction; causes which are all likely to operate with most force in the more populous districts. In short, while the number of commitments, or at least of convictions, for atrocious crimes, may be fairly taken as an index to the state of public morals, in a country where the laws are efficiently administered, the number of commitments for petty offences is a very uncertain criterion of the state of morals at different periods, or in different countries; since it may indicate only an alteration in the laws, or in the administration of penal justice. We may apply to this subject the language of St. Paul, that where the law enters, sin is made to abound, by being detected. The multiplication of laws necessarily gives rise to multiplied offences; and an improved police, while it really prevents crime, especially crimes of deeper dye, may have the effect of so increasing the proportion of minor, and even of greater offences that are brought under public cognizance, as to swell the records of crime. Who would judge of the comparative prevalence of murder or robbery in England and in Spain or Italy, by the number of crimes detected and punished by the magistrate? In like manner, the increased number of commitments for petty delinquencies in the same country, may not indicate, to any thing like the apparent extent, the increase of crime, or its greater proportion in the counties where the commitments are most numerous.

But, in whatever way the increase of convicted offenders may be accounted for, the fact is truly melancholy, and of fearful significance, that in England itself, the proportion is one criminal to every 740 inhabitants, exclusive of debtors, vagrants, and summary convictions before magistrates. The number of insolvent debtors discharged by the Court for Relief was, in 1829, 4063; viz. in town, 2225, and in country, 1838; and this must form a small part of the number of debtors committed to prison for different terms, varying from one to 100 days. In Whitecross-street prison alone, during the year 1829, there were confined on

process out of the Court of Requests, 756 for a term not exceeding 10 days; 778 for a term not exceeding 40 days; and 29 for a term of from 50 to 100 days; total, 1563. This number is exclusive of those confined under mesne process, or under judgements recovered. Of the number of vagrants and other summary commitments, we have no estimate. Taking all these into account, however, instead of 1 to 740, there must, we fear, be set down 1 to 500, at the lowest computation. And when we consider that every individual offender is related to some family that suffers disgrace or distress in consequence, the calculation becomes still more painfully affecting. In some cases, two or more offenders may be of the same family, and some may have no connexions; but, taking the number of commitments for criminal offences, debt, vagrancy, &c. at only 25,000, and the number of families in England and Wales at 2,800,000, this will make one individual in every 112 families, subjected, every year, to the disgrace and contamination of a gaol. If this calculation at all approximates to accuracy, it ought to rouse every man to consider the active causes of demoralization which are poisoning the constitution of society. One other circumstance deserves attention. Of the number committed for trial, in 1829, the males were 15,556, and the females, 3119, or about a sixth of the total number. But there is one class of crimes, the most degrading to the sex, of which the criminal law takes no cognizance.

What then are the remedies for this appalling amount of moral and political disorder? Where so much requires to be done for the health of the body politic, it is hard to say what measure, or what class of measures, claims to be viewed as of the most immediate importance. The most effectual would be of a preventive kind; but it would not be safe, when an evil has reached a certain height, to trust to any slow process of melioration. Measures of immediate mitigation must be adopted; and to these it is the object of the publication before us more particularly to direct the public attention. ‘Gratifying’, it is remarked, ‘as are the improvements which are at this time going forward in various branches of the jurisprudence of this country, much yet remains to be accomplished, before England will be exempt from the reproach of contributing by her institutions to the encouragement of crime. If ever there was a time when the public interests demanded, in an especial manner, the removal of defects in the criminal institutions of this country, the present is that period.’ Those defects relate to, 1. the state of the criminal law: 2. the state and regulations of the prisons; 3. the number of unnecessary commitments; 4. the state of the law of imprisonment for debt; 5. the want of some temporary provision for discharged offenders.

With regard to the first of these, the Committee, after giving

to the subject their best consideration, declare their firm conviction, 'that an effectual substitute may be found for the penalty of death, in a well regulated system of penitentiary discipline; a system which shall inspire dread, not by intensity of punishment, but by unremitted occupation, seclusion, and restraint.' In this conviction, we need scarcely say that we fully participate. In the former series of our Journal, our views of the inefficiency of sanguinary laws, were stated on more than one occasion*; and we are fully prepared to maintain them. At present, however, we shall merely call the attention of our readers to the tracts recently issued by the "Society for the Diffusion of Information on the subject of Capital Punishments", the first of which was given with our last Number. The present state of the criminal law is, indeed, so far behind the public sentiment, or rather in so direct opposition to it, that it would be absolutely impossible to carry its sanctions into execution. Capital punishment is consequently reduced, in the practice of the courts, to little more than an empty threat, which the offender laughs at, the probabilities of escape from death being 30 to 1 *after conviction and sentence to death*. But the chances of escape, from the reluctance of prosecutors to appear, of witnesses to give their testimony, of juries to convict, and even of the Bench to direct conviction, where the life of the culprit is at stake, are indefinitely multiplied, so as almost to destroy the terror inspired by the penal sanction; the *uncertainty* of the operation of the laws more than counterbalancing their severity. Besides, in contemplating the chance of escaping from the greater punishment, the criminal feels very little terror at the smaller; both because his attention is taken off from it, and because he estimates it by comparison with the danger he hopes to escape. Nor is it the least considerable evil, that, in the few cases in which the law is suffered to take its full effect, in the execution of the capital sentence, (cases of murder excepted,) the misguided feeling of the public is apt to take part with the culprit against the law, and to resent as injustice, as well as inhumanity, the infliction of the extreme penalty. Its remission having become the rule, the execution of it is an odious exception. Thus, too, even that most sacred and gracious prerogative of the Crown, the pardon of the criminal, has been deprived of all its lustre, from the necessity of having recourse to an indiscriminate mitigation of the punishment awarded by laws too sanguinary to be enforced, and therefore too inefficient to be duly respected. In no other country in Europe do such sanguinary enactments exist; by far the greater

* We may refer those of our readers who have sets, to *Ecl. Rev.* (2d Series,) Vol. XI. p. 1.; Vol. XII. p. 108, *et seq.*

part of them are of modern origin: and the existing practice, not less than the spirit of Christianity, and the common sentiments of humanity, supplies an emphatic condemnation of these foul blots upon the Statute-book.

It has been assumed by many persons, that the amendments recently introduced into the penal code, have deprived it of some of its most repulsive features. This, however, the Committee remark, is a serious mistake.

‘ It cannot be too generally known, that the measures referred to, although to a certain extent unquestionably beneficial, have fallen far short of the expectations to which they had generally given rise, and are by no means of that enlarged and practical character which the interests of society earnestly call for. By those measures, many discrepancies have been removed from the Statute Book; laws which had become obsolete have been repealed; redundant provisions have been condensed; immaterial forms have in certain cases been dispensed with, and absurd distinctions removed. The correction of such technical defects is not lightly to be appreciated; but, without underrating benefits thus conferred on the penal code considered abstractedly, it must not be forgotten, that the repeal of obsolete statutes has no effect whatever on the practical administration of criminal justice. It has in no degree affected the spirit and softened the rigour of the laws; and consequently, a feeling of severe disappointment was evinced, when, on the late re-enactment of the Forgery Bill, the punishment of death was retained for that offence. Numerous petitions were presented to the legislature from the bankers, merchants, and traders throughout the kingdom,—parties the most openly exposed to the violation of property,—protesting against the continuance of a penalty which, in effect, exposes them to depredation. Nor was this appeal in vain. On the passing of the Bill through the House of Commons, the cause of truth and humanity prevailed; and of the two hundred and eighty-nine Members present, one hundred and fifty-one decreed that the punishment of death should no longer be inflicted for the crime of forgery. Although the Bill, as thus amended, did not eventually become a law, this decision of the House of Commons is a sure indication that the hour is at hand, when the criminal code will not only be mitigated in respect to this offence, but that its spirit will be still further meliorated upon principles of an enlightened jurisprudence, and adapted to the sentiments and feelings of the community at large.’

We must refer our readers to the Report itself, for the views of the Committee as to the efficient penalties to be substituted for the punishment of death. Transportation is deprecated altogether as a secondary punishment; and the example of the United States is adduced in proof, that a system combining solitary confinement at night, hard labour by day, the strict observance of silence, and attention to moral and religious improvement, will be found the most powerful moral instrument for the correction of the guilty. Nothing can be more pernicious than the present *hulk*

system, both in respect to the convicts themselves, and to the community, upon which some hundreds of persons are annually discharged from those receptacles of vice, hardened in every species of enormity, and spreading pollution wherever they resort.

Owing chiefly to the indefatigable labours of the Committee, the most important improvements in prison discipline have taken place in the principal gaols throughout the kingdom. The highly interesting and satisfactory details will be found in the Appendix to the present Report. Most of the prisons attached to *corporate* jurisdictions, however, are still in a state so disgraceful as necessarily to corrupt all committed to them. This is especially the case with the gaol of Newgate, that standing reproach upon the first city in the world, and flagrant instance of the inefficiency of *corporate* jurisdiction! The gaols throughout Scotland also remain for the most part in as defective and disgraceful a state, as when they were visited by Howard. And the disorders prevalent in debtors' prisons call loudly, and in an especial manner, for amendment, as well as the law of imprisonment for debt itself.

'The distressed condition of Juvenile Offenders on their discharge from prison,' is a subject which well deserves the especial attention of the philanthropist, rather, perhaps, than of the legislator; unless, indeed, in place of the present costly, inefficacious, and baneful system of transportation, emigration could be rendered a measure of humanity and sound policy, by allowing the discharged offender to avail himself of emigration, as a resource, under arrangements favourable to the reformation of character. The hint thrown out by the Committee on this point, calls for serious consideration.

Other topics would naturally connect themselves with the general subject of this article, which it did not fall within the province of the Committee to notice. The diffusion of education is, however, with great propriety referred to as 'in every point of view the most efficacious remedy for the prevention of crime;' understanding by education, that 'course of moral training which shall impart religious impressions, control the passions, and amend the heart.' Among other preventive measures, the *legislative enforcement of the Sabbath*, in combination with the sedulous promotion of its religious observance by every legitimate method of influence, and the adoption of any plan that may tend to check the enormous abuse of *spirituous liquors*, are imperatively urged upon public attention by the condition of the lower classes. Sabbath-breaking and drunkenness, those twin sources of crime, are, indeed, gigantic evils, which, if not checked, threaten to loosen the bonds of society. The mixture of parish relief with wages,—that most iniquitous abuse which converts every labourer into a pauper, and stamps the whole transaction between him and

his master with the characters of oppression and fraud,—is an evil which calls not less loudly for redress. The lowness of wages is mentioned by the Committee as unquestionably one main source of criminal offence; and but for this system, they never could have fallen so low. But the lowness of wages is not so great an evil, as *the absolute dependence of the labouring classes upon their wages*; owing to the pernicious policy which has robbed them both of every auxiliary resource, and of the spirit of self-dependent exertion and economy. These are points to which we shall have future occasion to advert; and we must now content ourselves with having thus briefly indicated them. We beg, in conclusion, earnestly to recommend to our readers the Report before us, and to invite, on behalf of the Institution from which it emanates, the cordial support of ‘all who have at heart the welfare of their country, and the improvement and happiness of their fellow-men.’

Art. III. *An Essay upon National Character*: being an Enquiry into some of the principal Causes which contribute to form and modify the Characters of Nations in the state of Civilization. By the late Richard Chenevix, Esq., F.R.S. L. and E., M.R.I.A., &c. 2 Vols. 8vo. pp. 532, 590. Price 1l. 8s. London. 1832.

THIS is a work which we feel some difficulty in dealing with. The wide range of inquiry which it embraces, the multifarious nature of the topics that are brought before the reader, the abundant matter for discussion which they furnish, the paradoxical or doubtful character of some of the Author's opinions and assertions,—in short, the merits and defects of the work, alike render it difficult to do critical justice to it, without an extended analysis and comment, which our narrow limits forbid. The Writer was evidently an accomplished and extremely well-informed man, an acute and thoughtful observer of the phenomena of society, and practically versed in the knowledge of mankind. He had acquired, we are informed, from personal observation, an intimate acquaintance with the distinctive features of national character in the principal States of Europe. And for many years, his thoughts had been constantly directed to the subject of these volumes; in connexion with which he wrote several articles in the *Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews*, on the Comparative State of England and France. With such qualifications, added to extensive literary acquirements, a writer could not fail to produce a work replete with valuable observations and reflections; and, whatever we may think of the philosophical theory that serves as the ground-work of the present Inquiry, or of some of the Author's opinions, it is impossible not to be struck with his acuteness, instructed by his intelligence, and interested by the variety of information which is

rapidly passed before us. The illustrations of history with which these volumes abound, if not always profoundly philosophical, or morally just, are highly valuable, even as the mere opinions of so intelligent a thinker, supplying the reader with abundant materials for reflection; and, generally speaking, the sentiments are of a character that must command approbation, and inspire respect and esteem for the memory of the Author. The motives and occasion which first suggested the undertaking, are thus stated by Mr. Chenevix himself:

‘Placed, by fortuitous circumstances, in the midst of one of the most tremendous political convulsions that ever agitated a civilized and powerful people, and spread its influence over an enlightened world, his attention was soon engrossed by the scenes which were passing around him. An immense population, conceiving all at once that they had yielded up too large a share of their natural liberties, led or misled by the lights of what they called philosophy, undertook to reform their political condition, and to correct the malpractices which offended them. The further they advanced in the career of imaginary freedom, the more they became heated in the pursuit; and, in the warmth of their frenzy, each person formed to himself a different idea of the object which all had in view. One single point there seemed to be, round which all rallied; and that was, destruction. The more moderate sought to destroy a little; the most frenetic would have demolished everything. A greater horde of passions than ever at once broke loose upon mankind, burst forth from among the ruins of the oldest monarchy of Europe, and all were gigantic. The vices and virtues which grew amid the conflict, could no more be rated by the common standard of human good and evil, than could the winds which issued from the cavern of Eolus be measured by the breezes of Tempe. On every side the soul found something to make it shudder, even when it admired; and the nation, in which this awful scene of desolation was acting, had long been civilised, powerful, luxurious, and corrupted.

‘The contemplation of such a super-excitation of moral energy naturally led to the questions—Why are these things so? and, Would they be thus elsewhere?

‘The most direct mode of obtaining an answer, was to compare the history of the French with that of other nations. A coincidence soon became manifest, between what was thus learned, and what observation detected in living examples. A connexion, as little variable as human affairs could allow, became manifest, between the sentiments, passions, and intellects of nations, and the situation in which they had been placed by nature; and all their actions, all their thoughts, their institutions, and the minds which formed them, their government, religion, philosophy, industry, all seemed to follow, as natural and necessary consequences, from the circumstances which acted upon their feelings, moral and physical, from the very first moment they became inhabitants of earth.’ Vol. I. pp. 5—6.

The causes which contribute to form or to modify the character of nations, are arranged by the Author under two classes. The

first class consists of those which, acting directly either upon the physical or the moral nature of man, may be held as primary; including all the natural circumstances relating to the region or country in which men dwell. Such are climate, soil, temperature, geographical position, &c.; 'properties which come into action at the very first instant that a country possesses inhabitants, and continue to act until it is depopulated.' The second class comprises those causes which are the results of the primary ones, and which, re-acting upon the mind, complete the disposition which these had begun; causes connected with the social state and progress of mankind. Among them are religion, government, industry, literature, and 'every thing, which, being established among men as an institution of society, can impart an impression to the mind.' Of the mode in which the physical and the moral causes act in combination, and re-act upon each other, the following is given as an example.

'Among the most general of national institutions is government. It cannot be denied that government is a consequence of the national mind; and that the national mind is the result of the natural circumstances to which the nation is exposed. Government, therefore, is a result of natural circumstances. Government then cannot produce any effect upon the mind of a nation, which is not in unison with the effect produced by natural circumstances.' Vol. I. p. 17.

Supposing the Author's system to be philosophically correct, its chief value would seem to consist in its furnishing an explanation, or moral definition, of the national varieties of the human race; just as the system of the phrenologist offers an explanation of the intellectual varieties observable among individuals. The latter system, Mr. Chenevix considers as bearing, indeed, a close relation to his own; and 'considered as merely speculative', he says, the system of Gall and Spurzheim 'satisfactorily explains a greater number of phenomena, and accounts for a larger variety of sentiments and affections, seemingly incomprehensible, than any theory that ever was devised to explain the complicated nature of human beings.' Before he had become acquainted with it, he had arrived at the following coincident conclusions:

'First, he had admitted no faculty as primary and simple, which, to his great satisfaction, he has not found in their catalogue. Secondly, he had always attributed the condition of men and nations to innate faculties, and never had considered any faculty as created by any condition in which men or nations could stand. Thirdly, of all the systems of ethical philosophy which have come to his knowledge, the metaphysics of phrenology are those to which the opinions that he himself has long entertained bear the greatest resemblance. Fourthly, of all systems, that which admits no innate difference in the minds and dispositions of men, is the most repugnant to his reason. The truth or falsehood of the system of national character maintained in this

Essay, however, is wholly independent of the truth or falsehood of phrenology.' Vol. I. p. 13, note.

Phrenology, so far as it may deserve the name of a science, consists of the knowledge of a certain class of physiological facts, including the appearances which are the subject of observation, and the causes which explain them. To speak of the metaphysics of phrenology, or to give it the name of a system of ethical philosophy, is surely a strange misapplication of terms. It would be not more absurd to speak of the metaphysics of anatomy. As little can the Author's own system deserve the appellation of an ethical system. All that it pretends to do, is to trace the correspondence between national character and national condition,—between the moral development and the physical or political structure,—between the history of a nation and the causes which antecedently give a specific tendency to the national mind. The inquiry is curious and interesting, and may serve to throw light upon the natural history of man, and upon some political questions. But it is slenderly related to ethics; and the attempt to found a system of ethics upon any such basis, would be worse than idle: it would be a pernicious delusion. The value of physiological systems consists chiefly, if not altogether, in the facts which they include, and to which they profess to furnish an index; but their use is that of an index, which does not add to our knowledge, but only enables us to make better use of it. Theories that offer explanations of facts, although they may fail of their ultimate purpose, may yet be useful by bringing those facts under observation, and into a more distinct arrangement. Though not true in itself, a theory may serve as it were to hold truths together. Facts may be *threaded* upon a slender hypothesis; and though the arrangement be only ingenious or fanciful, it answers the purpose of classifying circumstances that are really similar and connected; enabling us, if not to discover causes, the better to appreciate existing connexions and actual effects.

Now this, if we mistake not, is the proper use to be made of the system which these volumes were written with the ambition of establishing. With the truth or fallacy of that system, few readers will concern themselves; nor are the practical conclusions very apparent to which the Author wishes to conduct us. The final sentence of the work, which might be expected to indicate the result of the investigation, is as follows.

'Of all the concerns of nations, the least mutable is character, since that alone is founded upon causes which cannot change.'

Yet, if the least mutable, it of course admits of mutation; and if founded upon unchanging causes, it is confessedly not wholly determined by them, any more than the growth of a plant is

wholly determined by its root. Admitting, then, the truth of the remark, it cannot be regarded as possessing the character of a very comprehensive or profound conclusion; and it might have found as appropriate a place in the first chapter as in the last.

But while we are unable to concede to these volumes the praise due to the higher class of philosophical works, we can strongly recommend them to the perusal of every one who is capable of being interested by either historical or physiological inquiries. For the reasons we have already given, we shall excuse ourselves from entering into any discussions connected with the Author's system, but shall proceed to lay before our readers the plan of the work, with a few extracts.

The first chapter is occupied with preliminary considerations. The second has for its object to shew, that *pride* and *vanity* are the agents which are most incessantly modifying the characters of men; and that they afford, by their respective prevalence, a principle of classification, applicable as well to communities as to individuals; according to which, all mankind may be divided into the proud and the vain; these two great classes being subject, however, to infinite modifications, according to the degrees and species of these sentiments which enter into every mind. The Author proposes, therefore, in his subsequent inquiry, 'to investigate the causes which give rise to the pride or vanity of nations; to consider the mode in which they contribute to influence the characters of empires, to regulate their political institutions, to govern their actions in peace and in war; in a word, to make them such as observation shews them to be at this moment, and such as history represents them to have been in the remotest ages of which any record is preserved.'

It may be supposed, that the terms pride and vanity are employed by the Author in a somewhat unusual and arbitrary acceptation. They are used to denote 'two modifications of self-approbation', for which language possesses, we are told, no accurate denomination. It is admitted, that the usual acceptation of these words is remote from the sense in which they are employed throughout this Essay. By pride, Mr. Chenevix intends, that just degree of self-approbation which is inspired by the intrinsic value of moral or intellectual actions: the simple fundamental faculties upon which this pride depends, are, he says, conscience, reason, and self-esteem. By vanity, he intends that self-approbation which is the mere reflection of the approbation of others,—a self-complacency 'independent of the intrinsic merit of its cause'. Both are represented as fair and laudable feelings.

'Nay, they are indispensable ingredients of the character; for, without the one, it would be deficient in dignity; without the other, we should want many of the motives which draw us toward our fellow-

creatures, and make society a necessity. The man who has none of either, would soon sink beneath his proper level; and he who has too much of them would aspire to rise above it.' Vol. I. p. 22.

We have promised to refrain from discussion, and will therefore merely intimate, that we cannot subscribe to this use of terms, or to the ethical principles laid down. We do not understand how the sentiment or feeling of self-approbation so differs from the 'fundamental faculty of self-esteem,' as to depend upon it; nor how self-complacent vanity can be properly represented as a modification of self-approbation; nor how the desire of self-approbation and the desire of the approbation of others, can be said to be the elements of the innate sentiments of pride and vanity. We should have imagined that a just feeling of self-approbation, resulting from the faculty of conscience, must have had some intimate relation to a sense of the Divine approbation; and that a just desire of the approbation of others, must have been connected with a desire to merit their esteem and love, and consequently with the social affections. We should have thought it unwise to adopt the names of vices, in a philosophical work, as the designation of such just and laudable feelings; and we might also have deemed it scarcely philosophical to represent those vices as only modifications of virtues. But we grant the Author his system for the sake of his facts, and proceed with our analysis.

Chapter III. treats of the Causes which develop and modify the pride and vanity of nations; exemplifies the development and progress of those national sentiments; and shews how they re-act upon the national character. Chapter IV. treats, in the same manner, of the causes, the progress, and the re-action of Social Improvement. Chapter V. treats of the causes, &c. of Religion. Chapter VI. of Morality. Chapter VII. of Government. Chapter VIII. of Intellect. This concludes the first volume. In the second volume, the same plan of inquiry is applied to, I. Industry. II. The Arts of War. III. Social Habits. IV. Patriotism. The Vth and last chapter is on the Mutability of National Character.

We select as our first specimen, the following extract from the Chapter on Morality, both on account of the importance of the facts it discloses, and because, in such comparisons, the Author seems peculiarly at home.

'From a comparative statement of the crimes committed in England and France, and still more of the punishments inflicted, it would almost appear that morality was less pure and absolute in the Protestant, than in the Catholic country; but such an inference would be altogether erroneous.

'In the first place, the laws of England and France do not weigh equally upon all offences. Many actions are considered in the former

as deserving the highest punishment, which, in the latter, are hardly cognizable to justice. In the Code Napoleon, unnatural crimes are not even mentioned, unless committed with violence. Capital executions are less frequent in France; theft, and even murder, have many means of evading death, as well by the letter as by the spirit of the law; while in England they can hope to escape it but by some attenuating circumstances, which may induce the mercy of the sovereign to commute the penalty. The legal import assigned to what is construed premeditation in either country, may put this in a clearer light. In England, the slightest indication of thought is sufficient to destroy the plea of sudden impulse. In France, unless a murderer is proved to have brooded over his crime for an almost infinite period, he is acquitted of premeditation, and condemned to reclusion, not to death. It is remarkable, that the nation whose habitual reflection is the least, should allow the longest time for criminals to meditate with impunity upon the perpetration of evil.

‘ Another reason for not placing confidence in French lists of crimes and punishments, is the establishment of an institution for which the public mind is not yet fitted—the trial by jury. The reasons which, in France, destroy the value of this great engine of security and justice, are too numerous to be quoted, but they may be reduced to three principal causes.

‘ 1st. The want of independence in the middle class, and their want of instruction and practical sense. 2d. The absurd mode in which juries are formed. Whoever has paid attention to criminal processes in that country, must agree that the proceedings and the decisions are often such as could hardly be expected in a civilized nation. A third reason is, that the most official documents there do not command implicit confidence. Public feeling does not yet require a faithful statement of existing evils; and though any member of the legislature may demand the communication of documents, a minister may refuse them. The mass of the French population is not yet convinced that, in a monarchy, where ministers, questioned upon the lives and properties of subjects, dare refuse to answer, the loss of liberty is more injurious to the state, than the publication of any crimes not quite unpunished.

‘ A fourth reason is, the participation of the French in an opinion which, as previously remarked, is shared by every vain nation,—that it is better to leave crimes unpunished, than to punish them too publicly. Nay, so far do they carry this principle, that they generally hold themselves less dishonoured when they swear to the innocence of a guilty relation, than when they give him up to chastisement. This prejudice was equally prevalent in the old as in the new government, for it is inherent in vanity.

‘ Whatever be the number of great crimes committed by the French, the few attempts made to purify the mass of society, the puerile pretension of endeavouring to appear better than they really are, and of sacrificing solid virtue for reputation, very much lower the standard of public morals. But none of these causes operate among the British, and the pride of this nation produces effects precisely the reverse of all that has now been stated respecting the inhabitants of France.

‘ 1st. The laws of England, as before observed, are, in many cases,

more severe than those of France. There is a crime on which public opinion, in the former country, pronounces itself with horror, which, by the law, is death, and of which nothing can wipe away the obloquy, but which, in the latter, is not considered as worthy of animadversion. There, the man who commits it, is not even pointed at as a profligate; the Code of Napoleon takes no cognizance of him. To those who have no means of judging national morals by closer inspection than the reports of trials, it would seem that France is more moral than England; but this apparent superiority is, in fact, due to indifference toward vice.

‘2dly. The chances of escaping punishment are less in England; consequently, the lists of crimes and punishments come more near to the truth. This may appear incredible to those who are in the habit of admiring the police of France, which could forestall intentions, and frustrate evil designs, at the precise moment necessary to procure conviction. In England, an institution which could ask of any man what he was going to do, could not subsist one hour. It is incompatible with political liberty, which Britons wisely prefer to a small addition to their individual repose. Yet the detection of crimes is more certain here, than in France, as innumerable instances might prove.

‘Another reason for a small chance of impunity in England is, the superiority of British juries, more accustomed to discuss truth, more enlightened, more conscientious, more devoutly weighing the evils of unjust condemnation and of impunity. Englishmen turn the entire powers of their mind to such investigations, and, as little as is possible for human beings, allow themselves to be swayed by personal considerations. In the hands of such men, the lives of their fellow-citizens are safe, and the guilty can seldom escape their penetration.

‘3dly. Official concealment of crime is neither the practice nor the theory of British functionaries, and entire reliance may be placed in the reports submitted to the public. Ministers too well know the impossibility of withholding communications demanded by public opinion. The government, no less than the nation, is convinced of the advantage of publicity, and both know that more danger would accrue from impunity or concealment, than from imparting the documents of national depravity.

‘4thly. The English are a proud nation, and their ambition is to be moral, rather than to seem so. They know that, whatever be the nature or the number of national crimes, the only way to keep the mass of society pure, is to take cognizance of them, and, at the expense of a little reputation, to extirpate corruption wherever it be found.

‘A further reason why the general morality of the two countries cannot be appreciated by lists of crimes and punishments, is, that many circumstances in the situation of England contribute to create extraordinary instances of great offences, which the law severely chastises. But those very circumstances are among the principal contributors to the general morality of the country in other respects. A nation, for instance, engaged in such extensive commercial relations as England, cannot but derive as much advantage from them in morals as in wealth. Commerce, on such a comprehensive scale, can have no basis but confidence, and confidence no foundation but honesty. Yet, the hope of

rapid gain must naturally tempt a few to speculate beyond their means; and among the victims of adventurous industry, some will yield to the suggestions of dishonest hope, till, at the last, the law overtakes them. Thus the catalogue of crime is swollen, while the immense additions which universal probity, the basis of commercial confidence, must make to national morality, is overlooked in the list of virtues.

* * * * *

‘But, notwithstanding official lists and documents, it may still be doubted, whether the number of crimes really is proportionably greater in England than in France. But what cannot be questioned, and what is of much greater national importance, is, that the remaining mass of society is much more pure; and not only this general superiority has existed in every period of the history of both countries, but examples of French depravity have frequently occurred, to which no parallel could be found in this island.

‘The reputation of being addicted to suicide is attached to the English, more than to any other nation. . . . The fact, however, is the reverse.

‘From a French document for the years 1815 and 1816, it appears that, in the former, the number of suicides committed in Paris, was one hundred and seventy-five; in the latter, one hundred and eighty-eight. In another part of the same document, it is stated that, in 1816, the bodies of two hundred and seventy-eight persons were exposed at the Morgue, the mode of whose death was unknown; but as these persons must have died by accidental death, by assassination, or by suicide, and, as it will afterwards appear, positive want of subsistence being a frequent cause of voluntary death in Paris, and these bodies being generally those of the lower orders, it is not too much to assume that one-third of this number had perished by suicide. The sum total, therefore, is two hundred and eighty, in a population largely estimated at seven hundred thousand.

‘From an official document of the suicides committed in London during the same year, and which must be considered as much nearer to the truth than the French report, the number was seventy-two, in a population which, upon the lowest computation, amounts to one million. Hence the proportion of suicides, in equal populations of England and France, is as one to five and a fraction. It is true the year 1816 was one of foreign invasion; but many other epochs confirm one to five as the lowest ratio of suicides in both countries. The French assert that the British lists of suicides contain only those whom a coroner’s verdict has returned as such, and that the coroner’s inquest always mitigates the sentence; but this assertion is unfounded, for the legal report is made according to fact, independent of causes.

‘Thus, although the incitements to suicide are greater in England than in France, the proportion deduced from the capital of either country is, at least, as five to one in favour of that nation in which religion, not honour, operates as the check. But the publicity of all the concerns of this country—the effect produced upon the public mind by so desperate an act as self-destruction—the importance attached to every thing which relates to national morals, hold up the

rarer instances of British suicide to more general notice, than the indifference of the French, and their silence upon all that can diminish public admiration.

‘The motives of suicide in France are far from being so dignified as in England; and if, in so criminal an act, the less important consideration of the cause and the manner can have any weight, the balance would lean very much in favour of the prouder people. Suicide in Britain is never committed with levity. The cause, too, is moral, more than physical necessity; while the proportion of the latter, as stated, in an official French document, to be among the motives of suicide, is truly afflicting.

‘That want of food, the hopelessness of procuring subsistence, should be so prevailing a cause of suicide in so luxuriant a country as France, must give rise to many sad reflections, were it not that they may all be summed up in this truth, which seems to pervade the globe, and to be the universal rule of human exertion:—Wherever nature has done the most for man, man does the least for himself.’

Vol. I. pp. 150—173.

The contrast between the two nations is still less to the advantage of our neighbours, in respect to another trait, which could hardly have been supposed to exist in so prominent a degree in the politest nation of Europe,—ferocity. ‘The nation that has retained the largest share of ferocity, which once was common among its barbarous ancestors, is that whose vanity is the most active,—France.’ We have neither room nor inclination to extract the horrible details which form the historic proofs of this remarkable fact; nor are we satisfied with the Author’s explanation of it. There is, however, too much foundation for the charge. French cruelty has hitherto not been diminished by the progress of social improvement. Yet, the late Revolution must be admitted to have exhibited much less of this national ferocity; and whatever be the causes, it may be hoped that they are not such as ‘cannot change’.

Mr. Chenevix is no enthusiastic or unbounded admirer of the Italian Republics, which have found in M. Sismondi, so eloquent an historian. The following remarks occur in the chapter on Government.

‘Not one of these republics, however admirable they may be in some respects, however superior to the ancient states of Greece and Rome, by the better kind of happiness which existed in them, and by the more equal right of every man to the protection of the law, deserves to be held up as a model of government in the present times. Experience has shewn, that the same extent of territory, united into one empire, is more prosperous than when subdivided into little states. Wars, which are frequent rather in proportion to boundaries than to surface, are more rare; and the central provinces which, when intersected, are exposed to perpetual hostility, are sheltered from attacks.

Disputes are less personal, and, if not always less sanguinary, are less tainted with rage, perfidy, and individual animosity—with all the petty but destructive passions which accompany weakness. If an emulation of talent sometimes raises the intellectual standard in a community of small states, as has been asserted of ancient Greece, of Italy in the middle ages, and of modern Germany, other causes of rivalry spring from the same source, and involve mankind in fatal difficulties. But the science of government is most particularly restricted by the subdivision of territory; because the virtue and wisdom necessary to make men wise, and good, and free, and happy, follow in a much more rapid progression than the direct increase of numbers and territory. It may easily be shewn, too, that it was not the rivalry of the other Greek republics which converted Athens into the emporium of mind, or mere emulation which made Tuscany the seat of modern art. The security, the duration of happiness and prosperity, are greater in extended empires; and the nations which have occupied the brightest, as well as the longest page in modern history, have not been small republics.

‘Notwithstanding all that has been said in favour of the Italian republics of the middle ages, by historians who seem to make liberty consist in disorder, it must be confessed, that the picture which they present, is composed of much violence and treachery. The vice which most particularly characterises small states, which supplies the place of strength to narrow minds—cunning—was the most prominent feature of Italy. Conspiracies, assassinations, the stiletto, poison, were the daily resources of the patriotic, and the secret dagger the noblest weapon of defence. Neither was it the country only that was covered with the emblems of lawlessness: in every town, ensigns of insecurity were unfurled; the houses of the great were converted into fortresses, surrounded by battlements, and flanked with towers, and every street became a field of battle. Domestic broils divided every city, and were the inheritance of every family. When internal force or artifices were not sufficient, foreign assistance was invoked, which either quelled or fomented discords, as its own interest required, and every occurrence afforded an opportunity for new insurrections. Such a condition of political existence is too dear a price for liberty, if indeed such a condition is compatible with that which has justice and security for its foundation.

‘Little, then, of internal policy is to be learned from the middle ages of Italy, applicable to the great states of modern Europe. The democracy of Florence, which excluded the nobility from public offices, and took from them the protection of the law, making common report sufficient evidence to condemn them, could not, at this day, be admitted by the wildest demagogue. The aristocracy of Venice, with its permanent inquisitors of state, its secret delations, its secret trials, and its secret executions, deserves to be mentioned at this day for no purpose but to shew that such an institution should be avoided. It is only as the commencements of reviving policy, and as the prelude to a better era than that of mythology, that these states command respect and admiration.

‘The Italian peninsula, in the middle ages, was a miniature of

Europe in its present state. It was composed of numerous realms, whose international relations were extremely complicated. In the twelfth century, during the quarrels between the Italian cities and the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, the number of states which adhered to his cause was eight, while eighteen had confederated to oppose him; and these six-and-twenty states embraced only the north of Italy. Amid so populous a community of cities, a code was necessary to regulate the social intercourse; and the law of nations, like most other intellectual improvements, had its origin in the south, upon small dimensions, and an humble scale, and rose to larger growth in the dilatory north. From Italy, this code has spread over Germany, a much greater extent of territory, where it was improved by wider relations and stronger powers of reflection; and what in the former was confined to practice, in the latter was matured upon principles. In the country where morality is more absolute, too, it was divested of one of the great vices which debased it in the regions of debility and luxury—perfidy; and though it assumed another appearance—force, sometimes ferocity—it was no longer sullied but by defects which social progress never fails to diminish.

Vol. I. pp. 241—3.

It is one defect in the plan of the work, that the same historical circumstances and personages are again and again referred to and dilated on, in different points of view, but so as to give the effect of repetition. Thus, Cromwell, the Stuarts, the Bourbons, as well as Philip, Scipio, and Cæsar, pass and repass before us. We premise this, in selecting one of several passages relating to the same period of our history: it occurs in the chapter on Patriotism.

‘Of the many usurpers known in history, Cromwell is not the most unpatriotic or self-interested. That he was ambitious, factious, criminal,—that he monopolised the powers of the realm by unjust means, is certain. But he was not a conqueror: he did not lavish the blood of England in running after foreign victories, or squander away her strength that he might be called a hero. To make her formidable and respected, was indeed his ambition; but when ambition is thus bounded, it is laudable. It is a saving, not a destroying principle. Neither was destruction, in any of its shapes, his passion. He shed but little useless blood. He was not merciless, like Robespierre; nor, like Buonaparte, did he keep up a preternatural excitation in the people, which could be followed but by prostration and debility. Without stepping beyond the circle which nature had assigned to his empire, he left behind him as many monuments of wisdom, and as few of vanity, as rulers generally do, whose title rests on worthier foundations than their crimes.

‘Had the two succeeding sovereigns been as patriotic as was this man, usurpation and regicide apart, the House of Stuart might still be on the throne. But the dissoluteness of Charles II., his attachment to the greatest enemy of England, his enmity to her best ally, prove how little he loved his country; and his desire of pleasure left

him no resource but to make his people as dissolute as himself. To this end he bent his efforts, and was in part successful ; though, happily, the nation recovered its virtues under a more bigoted prince. The affection of James to England was greater than Charles had ever felt ; for he was frugal of her resources, jealous in asserting her naval superiority, in encouraging her trade and industry, and in maintaining her national honour ; in short, attached to every thing relating to her, except her creed and charter. Had his subjects been of the same mind as he was upon these matters, they would have found him abundantly patriotic.

‘ But, whatever may have been the disposition of this family towards the realms which they governed, the people were truly patriotic, and could not brook a monarch whose feelings did not harmonize with theirs. A first revolution broke out, in which all was, for a time, dictated by love of country ; but of which faction finally became the master. In the second revolution, there was as little of private ambition or of self-interest as can be expected in human affairs ; and patriotism was the constant and universal guide.

‘ From this great event, the completion of British patriotism may be dated. Instances, indeed, might be adduced to shew that the feeling occasionally met with interruptions ; but, in a wide view, the exceptions have been fewer and less dangerous than might be expected in a country where liberty leaves such openings to the conflicts of passion ; and infinitely smaller than are to be found in nations where every sentiment is smothered by rule, and every thought repressed by despotism. The exceptions, it is true, are glaring, and the outcry against them vehement ; but that is because the feeling is so strong and general, that millions cry, and cry aloud, when only one has failed. In the silence of oppression, none dares say that a superior errs, even when he sins ; but the patriotism of a free people is jealous of his slightest foibles.

* * * * *

‘ From this rapid sketch, the true nature of British patriotism becomes at once apparent. The object of its veneration, unlike that which other monarchies adore, is the country, not the sovereign ; and in all its bearings, so much more multiplied when a nation, not a man, inspires it, its first and greatest element is pride.

‘ Although the prince or dynasty who governed England, has always been much less its idol than the nation itself ; yet, when once the English have professed a regard and esteem for a sovereign, they are capable of greater sacrifices for his welfare, than the vain nations, whose only patriotism is their monarch.’ Vol. II. pp. 520—523.

We can make room for only one more extract, and must resist the temptation to comment which it supplies. The passage occurs in the last chapter of the second volume, ‘ on the Mutability of National Character ’.

‘ The country to whom, amid the future generations of empires, the greatest number shall look back as to their parent, is England ; and though the mutual feelings between colonies and their mother country

are not always filial and paternal—though gratitude and affection often are wanting between them—yet none will be able to refuse its admiration to the little kingdom which has engendered so many worlds. The bitterness which England must feel towards the United States for having shaken off their allegiance,—the resentment of the latter against the opposition made by England to their independence, however strong and lasting, cannot prevent the one from owning that, without such lessons as Britain gave them, they would not now be free, or make the other blind to the progress which her colony has made since its emancipation, and to the still greater prospects which open on its future destinies. Whether similar contests will attend the liberation of the other British possessions, must be decided by time; but, taught by experience, all parties may perhaps be more rational. Most especially, too, England, who so well knows that the part of every generous nation is to make her colonies as prosperous as she can, may have learned that the natural and indestructible tendency of every colony is toward independence, and that the opportunity will come the sooner, the earlier and the greater is that prosperity. In such a case, it is possible that the most amicable relations may continue between parent states and colonies, and that emancipation may be granted without animosity, and received without reproach.

It is by the empires which England has created, by the degree of civilisation which she has diffused, and the tracts of earth over which she has spread it, that she must be judged by posterity. The only rule for appreciating nations is to compare original means with the ends attained; and in what nation did the latter ever shew such an excess above the former as in Britain? The Greeks had greater natural advantages, but used them not so wisely. The Romans did for themselves as much as a people could do; but the rest of mankind felt rather their ambition than their benevolence. Among modern states, not one could be named that has disseminated so much good, and so little evil, as England. Spain and Portugal discovered new seas and lands: England discovered and enlightened them. Germany has not been in a situation favourable to maritime adventures. France, with extensive coasts, and all the power and knowledge which could make her great by sea, has indeed completed voyages of circumnavigation; but she has planted few colonies, and can appeal to no deserts, once unpeopled, to prove that the men who now inhabit them are her offspring. The public monuments of England can bear no comparison with the stupendous edifices which the Romans erected in their conquests. They are surpassed by those of ancient Greece, of modern Italy, and of nations much inferior in the arts of embellishment. Upon the useful establishments which make her present superiority, and so far surpass the conceptions of all other nations, time can more easily lay its pitiless hand, than upon hewn stone and brass. The roads, six times as numerous, and incomparably more practicable than in any other country, must leave less traces behind them than the ancient causeway; and, overgrown with grass, their thin beds of loose pebbles may be turned up by the ploughshare. Their present perfection may make their obliteration more easy. The canals which now are thronged with traffic; which, in their ordinary course, are so

modest, though so magnificent when any obstacle is to be overcome; may more easily burst their dikes, or be filled up with mud, than those whose boast was architecture, not trade. The subterraneous works of the greatest city of the world, the dwelling of more than a million and a half of men, may lie underground forgotten, and leave no towering arch to strike the eye, like the Appian or the Claudian aqueducts. Envy, too, may pen the history of England, and rival nations gratify their enmity by detraction. Spain may tell how the Catholics have been persecuted, and the library of the Inquisition record the condemnations of the men who were punished for conspiring against the sister-in-law of King Philip. France may charge her civil wars with perfidy; her revolution with cruelty; her policy with intrigue. All nations may lend her their own vices. The United States, indeed, will call her ancient annals theirs, and glory in having had such princes as Edward and Henry; but will they be thus candid on her future story? They must; their own existence will testify against whatever malice they may yet retain. When they behold themselves, and think how they were founded; when they read their own laws and constitution, and reflect from whom they held them, and the spirit which enacted them; when they see, in other regions, other nations happier and freer than natural circumstances would have made them, and find the languages of all to be derived from one source—from the idiom which Shakspeare, Bacon, and Newton spoke; they will be forced to say, 'Had England not been great and generous, these things could not have been.' When the greatest of republics shall allow that Britain was the freest of kingdoms, all will own that no nation of the world ever was so prolific a parent of mighty empires.' Vol. II. pp. 575—578.

After perusing these copious and interesting specimens, no one requires to be told, that the work from which they are taken, notwithstanding all that is faulty in the Author's plan, or unsatisfactory in his ethics and philosophy, is a production of no ordinary merit and interest; one that will amply repay perusal, and not only so, but will provide for itself a place in the library. We have not spoken of the Author's style, which constitutes no small part of the attraction and charm of the work. Uniformly perspicuous, correct, and unaffected, it sometimes rises into eloquence. As the Author's pride and vanity are now alike buried in the dust, our approbation or censure cannot affect him; but we have been not the less anxious to do justice to a work upon which have been bestowed the meditation of a life, and the best efforts of a mind of no ordinary endowments.

Art. IV.—1. *The Annual Biography and Obituary*: 1832. Vol. XVI. 8vo. Price 15s. London, 1832.

2. *The Georgian Era*: Memoirs of the most eminent Persons who have flourished in Great Britain, from the Accession of George I.

to the Demise of George IV. In Four Volumes. Vol. I. The Royal Family; the Pretenders and their Adherents; Churchmen; Dissenters; and Statesmen. Small 8vo. pp. 582. London, 1832.

THE Annual Biography maintains its average character, as a convenient repository of fugitive memoirs of persons by right or by courtesy entitled to the appellation 'celebrated', who may have deceased during the previous year. The present volume contains thirty-one memoirs, and a biographical index comprising shorter notices of a greater number of individuals, many of them not less 'celebrated' than those whose lives are detailed at greater length. For example, Archdeacons Parkinson and Churton, James Hamper, and the Rev. Philip Taylor, whose memoirs adorn the present volume, were unquestionably very celebrated persons; yet, it may be thought that Archbishop Magee, Earl Mulgrave, Mr. Jodrell, and even Mr. Bragge Bathurst, who have only a niche in the index, were scarcely less prominent public characters. For this appearance of partiality or want of judgement in the selection of the subjects of the memoirs, it would not, however, be fair to hold the Editor entirely responsible; as he has no doubt been guided chiefly by the facility of obtaining available materials. Among the most distinguished names which occur in the contents of the present volume, are those of Henry Mackenzie; John Abernethy; Mrs. Siddons; the Rev. Robert Hall; Thomas Hope; William Roscoe; N. T. Carrington; James Northcote; and Lord Norbury.

The memoir of the Rev. Robert Hall, who is very unnecessarily dignified with the title of D.D., is taken chiefly from the pages of the Imperial Magazine. It is not free from inaccuracy, but is substantially correct in the main facts. We refrain, however, from entering more particularly into the subject, till we have before us the accredited memoirs which will appear in the last volume of Mr. Hall's collected works.

We shall avail ourselves of the biographical memoir of the Author of Anastasius, to lay before our readers some account of one of the most singular productions that ever issued from the press, but of which we have only read enough to enable us to appreciate the heroic perseverance of the individual who could qualify himself to give an analysis of such recondite absurdity. The learned Translator of the kindred productions of the Hindoo sages, of the *Carma-mimansa*, and the *Brahma-mimansa*, must have had scarcely a much more arduous task, Mr. Hope's English being very cognate to Sanscrit. We know not who is 'the literary friend' to whom we are indebted for the following analysis; but we tender him our best thanks.

"The 'Essay on the Origin and Prospects of Man,' published posthumously, is only a preliminary portion of a work much more ex-

tensive, which Mr. Hope had long meditated, on Beauty ; comprising, under that term, every species of attribute, physical and intellectual, of which the mere passive contemplation affords, through the channel of the senses, the exalted pleasures of which the cause is called beauty. How far this Essay will enhance the brilliant reputation of the author of "Anastasius," may be questioned ; but no one, whose taste for abstruse disquisition may lead him through the three volumes of which it consists, will deny it to be the production of a mind of more than ordinary talents and acquirements. It is to be regretted that the difficulties incident to such discussion should be further increased by the adoption of a peculiar style, modelled on a theory which is announced and vindicated in the introduction: in fact, so foreign is it in its structure as to require continual translation into the English of which the vocabulary consists.

"The fundamental principle of Mr. Hope's cosmogony is, that all things are generated by time and space:—to these succeed gravitation, centrifugal and centripetal ; from which, as the principle of all aggregation and combination, arise the earliest modifications of electricity ; namely, those which produce the force of cold, combination, and substance,—cold being the connecting link between mere force and positive substance. Substance, which at first is radiant, consolidates, according to the determining circumstances, into forms gaseous, liquid, and solid. From amorphous matter, by the action of electricity and cold, is produced crystallization ; the highest and completest form of substances inorganic. By decombinations brought about by the agency of heat, and other recombinations, we ascend by a scale to substance organic and living, vegetable and animal ;—proving, contrary to the accepted belief, that, after the creation of inorganic matter, another distinct creation was necessary, in order to infuse into the former the principles of life ; that in the very conditions of mere time and space, in the very first act of the creation, were already laid the seeds of its last and highest developements, not only vital, but sensitive and intellectual ; and that it was impossible, when the former arose, the latter should not, in their turn, out of them have arisen.

"These views, strange as they must appear, are developed in a most elaborate argument, supported by the resources of an imagination highly active, and aided by an extensive reference to authorities both ancient and modern, sacred as well as profane. This is not the place for more than the most rapid summary of a work, to do full justice to which would occupy a space much more considerable than we could, consistently with our general plan, devote to it ;—but the alleged natural history of man is too singular to be wholly passed over. When, it seems, in the progress of creation, the elements of organized substance, by successive combinations and decombinations, had arrived at a condition suited to the formation of beings, not only vital and sentient, but intellectual, these elements, meeting from opposite points by pressure, gradually accumulated and combined, until they resulted in man ! This process going on simultaneously wherever the elements were to be found, it follows, that every part of the world so circumstanced was in a condition to produce its *autocthones*. The genus man thus comprises distinct species, each deriving from its own peculiar

parent stock, discriminated one from the other by a comparative scale of excellence, both in physical and in intellectual capacity; the former, if not determining the latter, at least being its unerring index. Between these several races is a boundary, not only distinct and well defined, but impassable: so that a Caffre or a Samoyed could no more, by whatever pains in education or discipline, be elevated to the comprehension of European science, than the dullest of brutes be trained to the sagacity of the elephant. The cause of these differences Mr. Hope traces to certain circumstances in climate, soil, and situation; and he observes, that it is in those regions where Nature has been more than ordinarily bountiful to the inferior animals, that she has seemed most niggardly to man: for the elements, forestalled and exhausted by the combinations necessary for the formation of the former, were but scantily afforded in their concurrence for the formation of the latter. The country of the ourang outang and the elephant is at the same time the birthplace of the most degraded of the human species; and, on a comparison, it may fairly be called in doubt, whether, in that country, the advantage remain with the man, or with the brute: the former, it is true, is possessed of faculties of which the other is wholly deprived; but so imperfectly are they developed, as scarcely to be of any value, while he is greatly inferior in those physical qualities, and in the senses, they enjoy in common.

“Of the original races, some, both of the highest and of the lowest species, have become extinct. The latter have perished and left no trace; but of the former, the records of ages of the remotest time indicate a people, cultivated in arts and manners, theists in religion; the first and most excellent of creation; whose stature, form, and longevity, attest an immeasurable superiority; and from whose wreck, mixed up with baser matter, was collected and preserved by tradition all that has since formed the basis and nucleus of civilisation. Such were the Bible Patriarchs before the flood—such the Titans of mythology—such the Præ-adamites of Arabian fable. Next in order of excellence must be placed the stock anciently inhabiting the country between the Euxine and Caspian, to the south; chiefly known by the colony which, under the name of Pelagians, Hellenes, and Dorians, settled in Greece, and the country along the coast of the Mediterranean adjacent. These were alike beautiful in form, and exquisite in faculty; by them was carried to rapid perfection all that is in art most rare, and in science most abstruse; and it is according as succeeding generations approach the purity of this race, that they will approximate to an excellence which, deteriorated as they are, they never can hope fully to attain.

“Pursuing the analogy by which he has, from the simplest elements (elements not yet obvious to the senses, scarcely indeed to the imagination), traced the concatenation to shapeless masses, to crystallised substance, to organisation, to vitality,—till, in the latest and highest link, the diapason closes full in,—Mr. Hope follows the decombinations of this world, to other combinations in a more central and less imperfect sphere, in which they will be absorbed; forming there an entity comprehending all modifications, inanimate and animate, inorganised and organic, vegetable and animal, sentient and intellectual, from the first and simplest to the last and highest, on which it was founded.

“Such are the speculations of a writer, long holding a distinguished place among the authors of the day, but in a department of literature so distinct from that which occupied his latter years, that few, in perusing them, would recognise the author of those works on art, and above all, of that splendid fiction by which Mr. Hope is chiefly known. In these metaphysical disquisitions there is strong internal evidence of an earnest and sincere pursuit of truth, and of amiable and benevolent feelings, which, however obnoxious Mr. Hope's paradoxes may be, cannot fail to conciliate: and if his reasonings do not convince, they at least afford ingenious views, well followed up; and, to the few, materials for thinking.” pp. 260—3.

Materials for thinking! So does a Babylonian brick, or an inscription in the arrow-headed character. But these suggest reflections of a less melancholy kind. The first impression produced by inspecting Mr. Hope's volumes, is, that he intended them as a *hoax* upon the philosophic world. But this explanation of his design, the reader is forced to dismiss, and after trying at various solutions of the enigma, is led to give up the attempt to resolve the work into either its causes or its elements.

We have been much interested with the brief and simple memoir of the amiable and gifted Author of “*Dartmoor*.” It affords us a pleasing satisfaction to know, that to the favourable notice which Mr. Carrington's first publication received in our Journal, he considered himself materially indebted for the success it obtained; and the ingenuous gratitude with which he acknowledged as a favour what was an act of mere justice, evinced the modesty and sensibility of true genius. We shall do no injustice to his memory, by inserting the following warm effusion of his feelings.

PLYMOUTH DOCK, MAY 24, 1823.

SIR,

‘It was not until yesterday, that a friend informed me of the very favourable review of the *Banks of Tamar* in the *Eclectic Review* for May. The bookseller who used to supply me found the number for May missing in his parcel, and it was with some difficulty that to day I have succeeded in borrowing a number from Plymouth. Accept now, Sir, the overflowings of a grateful heart for your kind mention of my book—you have cheered the waning days of a life of uncommon toil and anxiety. That volume—the “*Banks*”, was composed under circumstances, such as I could not mention, and which would have appalled ninety-nine men out of a hundred. But you have amply repaid me for all.

‘The Editor of the *Telegraph Paper* will, next week, copy the greater part of the Review of my Poem. The Editor of the *Plymouth Magazine* has also determined on the same course. The result of all this will be highly favourable to my interests: for notwithstanding the cheering reception which the Volume met from the local press, the sale has not extended beyond the Subscription.

‘ Once more, Sir, accept my most grateful acknowledgements. You are unknown, Sir, to me, but you have treated me with a gentlemanly kindness and a generosity which has made an impression *never* to be effaced.

‘ I am, Sir,

‘ Your much obliged and most obedient Servant,

‘ N. T. CARRINGTON.’

‘ The EDITOR of the ECLECTIC REVIEW.’

To receive—we do not say to deserve—such acknowledgements as these, are among a Reviewer’s most rare and precious perquisites.

The *Georgian Era*, is the title of a respectably executed series of short biographical notices, such as might well enough have gone towards the composition of a biographical dictionary. But in a work of that description, the Editor remarks, ‘ the memoirs of contemporaries, of fellow-countrymen, of associates in arms, in enterprise, or in policy, are, on account of the alphabetical arrangement, *posited* far apart; and the Compiler is therefore compelled to repeat at length the narrative of the public transactions in which they individually bore a share.’ In the present work, the lives are classified, by which means the necessity for repetition is in some degree avoided. All the lives have been rewritten; and every possible exertion, we are told, has been made to elucidate doubtful points, and to rectify the errors of preceding writers. So far as we have examined the articles, they sustain very fairly, with little exception, the Editor’s ‘ fearless claim ’ to impartiality, and a laudable endeavour to secure accuracy. We cannot, however, say much in favour of the plan, the classification being far from unobjectionable in itself; and the selection is so defective as to require a clumsy appendix of minor articles. Nor can we approve of the insertion of living public characters: it is alike unnecessary and unsatisfactory, invidious and offensive. What good reason can be assigned for inserting a memoir of Edward Irving in the main body of the work, and dismissing Dr. Chalmers to the end of the Appendix? It is strange that the Editor’s diligent inquiries should not have made him acquainted with the appointment of Dr. Chalmers to the Divinity Professorship in the University of Edinburgh. As a specimen of the articles, we take, almost at random, the concluding part of the memoir of the first Earl of Liverpool.

‘ The earl was a respectable politician, a neat speaker, an assiduous man of business, and an able expositor of international law; on which subject, he published several works. Of his last production, *A Treatise on the Coins of the Realm*, the Edinburgh Reviewers spoke in the following terms:—“ It is pleasing to find one, who must necessarily have been bred among the exploded doctrines of the elder economists, shaking himself almost quite loose from their influence, at an advanced period of life; and betraying, while he resumes the fa-

avourite speculations of his early years, so little bias towards errors which he must once have imbibed. It is no less gratifying to observe one who has been educated in the walks of practical policy, and grown old amid the bustle of public employments, embellishing the decline of life by pursuits which unite the dignity of science with the usefulness of active exertion."

'During a considerable part of his political career, Lord Liverpool was odious to the multitude, on account of a generally-received opinion, which Burke strengthened, in a pamphlet on popular discontents, that he was the secret adviser of his sovereign. In consequence of this supposition he was designated as leader of the king's friends. But his fortunes prospered in spite of his unpopularity: he out-lived the generation that hated him; and altogether ceased to be obnoxious. He was one of those practical men of business, who, by moderate abilities, and prudence of conduct, invariably get forward, in whatever situation of life circumstances may throw them;—who improve events to their own advantage;—who, while they possess sufficient skill to be useful, are not endowed with enough of talent to produce envy;—who, eventually, obtain a general experience that renders them of importance, with an intimate knowledge of subordinate matters, which their superiors usually scorn to acquire, but must possess in another, if not in themselves; and who, at last, tortoise-like, slowly, but surely outstrip such of their competitors as, with natural powers vastly superior, are not endowed with the same all-conquering steadiness and perseverance.'

The character of the late Lord Londonderry is equally good.

'In person, Lord Londonderry was well formed, but not elegant; and his features, although handsome, had rather a dull and inanimate expression. In private life he was kind, conciliating, and liberal. When, at the conclusion of the war, his brother was rewarded with a peerage, he would not permit him to accept the usual pension with it, but generously gave him an equivalent out of his private fortune. While in power, he is said to have gratefully remembered his former benefactors: and, it is added, that he never broke a promise, express or implied, nor abandoned a friend who claimed and merited his assistance.

'For a long period he was not only the ministerial leader in the house of commons, but the most influential member of the cabinet; and, during a great portion of his life almost uninterruptedly in possession of power, yet scarcely ever popular. By a suppleness, which was rarely perceptible to its dupes, and a self-complaisant effrontery, which never became either arrogant or offensive, he attained a political station far too exalted for his talents. He appeared to be perfectly unconscious of the inadequacy of his mental powers for the proper discharge of his high duties; and, probably, thought he was acting a wise and beneficent part, when his conduct was most absurd and despotic. His actions, through his comparative ignorance, were frequently at utter variance with his disposition. He seemed to think, that increase of freedom could not procure increase of happiness; and that, by enforcing implicit obedience to the high behests of their superiors,

he added to the welfare of men. Though lenient and placable in nature, his was decidedly the iron age of policy: the current of free, liberal, and enlightened opinions was stemmed and pent up during his administration; but only to rush forward with more rapid and overwhelming impetuosity after its fall.

As a man of business, he was active and energetic; as a public speaker, plausible, but not elegant. It has been said of him, that he swayed the house of commons entirely by his manner. Although never eloquent, his perfect self-possession, his complacency, and tact, rendered him skilful and effective as a debater. He could be copious in words, without uttering an idea; and apparently candid, when his object was to mystify or conceal. He never laboured under the awkward drawback of modesty; but could, on every occasion, unblushingly deliver a speech without a legitimate beginning, middle, or end; full of unnecessary parentheses; lengthened out by repeated intangible propositions; and, on the whole, absolutely "signifying nothing." It does not appear that he was, by any means, eminent for his knowledge of French; and yet, it is asserted, that he once spoke an oration, to the members of the congress at Vienna, in that language, "three hours long, and without a single interruption."

The series of wood-cut heads which disfigure the volume, have not the merit or spirit of caricatures, and are a very needless waste of paper, as no one would think of binding them up with the volume.

Art. V. 1. *The Records of a Good Man's Life, et cetera*. By the Rev. Charles B. Tayler, M.A., Author of "May you like it", &c. 2 Vols. pp. 672. (Portrait.) London. 1832.

2. *May you like it*. By Charles B. Tayler, M.A. Fifth Edition, Corrected. 2 Vols. 18mo. London. 1832.

3. *Shades of Character; or the Infant Pilgrim*. By the late Mrs. Woodrooffe, of Somerford Keynes. 2 Vols. Second Edition, London. 1830.

THERE are two descriptions of publications, with regard to which we find it impossible to avoid falling into deep arrears,—sermons and tales. So rapid is the production of these fugitive species of literature, so fast do they multiply upon our shelves, that to notice all becomes impracticable, and to select any for notice, almost invidious. Specimens of the English, Scotch, Irish, and American Pulpit, in some fifty volumes, reproach at this moment our neglect; and we have had some idea of inserting an advertisement on our cover,—'Wanted, a Reviewer of Sermons, who will undertake to read them himself, and to furnish articles thereupon, that others will read.' As to tales, they may

stand a fairer chance of being *read*, but what can be said about them? Our recommendation they scarcely need, nor would the public wait for it. Our interdict would not be respected. Tales, the public will have; and although we should prefer that religion were taught in another way, children of every age must be instructed by pictures and parables. The danger is, that such reading should be *exclusively* indulged in.

The works before us are admirable of their kind. Charles Tayler is deservedly a favourite with the best part of the public. He must be classed with sentimental writers, but his style of sentiment, chaste, domestic, unaffected, and devout, differs as widely from the heartless, flippant sentimentalism of Sterne, as from the false sentiment of Marmontel; reminding us more of Mackenzie and Berquin, yet closely resembling neither. We know no writer who succeeds without egotism in inspiring a stronger feeling of sympathy, on the part of his readers, towards himself; that sympathy on which much of the charm of poetry depends,—and his tales have the spirit of poetry. Of the merits and faults of his compositions, however, we have more than once intimated our opinion; and shall therefore say the less of the publications before us. “May you like it,” is a mere reprint of the Author's first production, in two very pretty volumes, and being in its fifth edition, we need say nothing more in its favour. The “Records of a Good Man's Life” occupy the first volume of the publication to which they furnish the title; the second being composed of *et cetera*,—most of which have appeared in the *Annals* or in a former publication of the Author's. We give the titles:—Fulgentius and Meta. Joan of Kent. The Lady Anne Carr. Guyon of Marseilles. The Lady Lisle. The Lowly Lady. Anne of Cleves. The Son and Heir. A Vision of Conscience. Mr. Tayler excels in his historical legends, which have an effect similar to that of old family paintings in an antique picture gallery. That he should sometimes take the poetical side of history, is inevitable. Joan of Kent is an admirably told story, and Anne of Cleves is a beautiful narrative; but Lady Lisle is our favourite. But we shall take our extracts from the contents of the first volume, premising one word in the ear of the Author; that we do not hold the office of Godfather or Godmother to be either ‘blessed’ or authorised, and that we must not be supposed to pledge ourselves to an absolute accordance with him on the litigated point of baptism. Waiving these matters, we have been so highly pleased and edified with the good sense, good feeling, and piety displayed in these imaginary Records, that we cannot but wish all our readers to enjoy the same gratification. Those who cannot agree with worthy Mr. Singleton at the font, will like him in the pulpit or in the parlour. But we must extract a paragraph or two from the records of his early life.

‘ I must always look back with sorrow to the day I was sent to school. Words and things which I had never heard of in my father’s house, were brought into dangerous familiarity with me ; words and things deeply corrupting to the manly, no less than to the Christian character. Such was the case also at Eton. I was made, as school-boys generally are, wise in what ought to be forbidden knowledge to a child. I cannot say I was disgusted as I ought to have been. My curiosity was awakened, and many seeds of wickedness that might have been destroyed in the germ, were then drawn forth from my heart, and fostered into fatal life.

‘ The very studies of the place, (I do not mean of Eton alone, but of any school where the classics are taught,) have a degrading and debasing tendency, and always will have, unless the master is decidedly and avowedly a Christian teacher. All call themselves Christian teachers, but how few shew the real spirit of a Christian, in pointing out what is to be condemned as pernicious in almost every sense. The Christian youth is left to draw his own conclusions. The indecent and even monstrous histories of those who are the only gods of the profane world, have a sort of charm with them from the deep interest of the narrative, or the bright and glowing language in which they are set before him. Thus, notions and ideas decidedly injurious to the Christian mind, and to true manliness of character, are insensibly acquired, and the mind is led to associate lasciviousness and impurity with heroic virtue. It is better to have a manly than a classic tone of mind, if the one is to be acquired at the risk of the other. Often and often, before I could read Latin and Greek, have I turned over page after page of the dictionary of classical biography that lay on my desk, or of the English translation, (a copy lent me by one of my school-fellows,) that had its hiding place within the desk, and found much pleasant amusement from histories that never ought to have met the eyes of a Christian boy.

‘ I have naturally a high and impetuous spirit and no lack of false shame, and I met with many trials and many lessons at Eton. I had so much to do, and so much amusement, that I began to shorten the time I had been accustomed to set apart for prayer, and consequently I began to lose many of the supports and comforts of our holy religion. Oh ! if we did but feel that when we neglect prayer — if we did but feel that the injury to ourselves is far greater than the dishonour done to God ! We are not required to pray merely because prayer is God’s appointed means by which we are to receive His blessing ; but because by prayer a wise and holy sense of our dependence on the Lord is kept up in hearts naturally disposed to assert a senseless and most fatal independence of Him, and because prayer, or communion with God, is the season when man is admitted to an interview with God, and converses with God ; when the child returns to his Father’s arms, and speaks to his Father’s ears the wants and sorrows of his heavy heart ; when the lost wretched sinner sees, with the eye of faith, the clouds and thick darkness pass away from the home he seeks in vain with the eye of mortal sight ; when he sees that home in Heaven, and in the midst, as his blessed and holy assurance, a lamb as it had been slain.

‘ Alas ! alas ! notwithstanding all the instruction I received, it was

long before I could comprehend the real use and comfort of prayer and other blessed means of grace. It was not the teaching of man, but of the Spirit, through the experience of my own heart, that made these things plain to me; that brought home and as it were applied the holy instruction of my human teachers in religion, and made me exclaim, as I do now, when I neglect prayer—"O Lord! I am the loser when I seek thee not. Thou lovest only the homage of a wretched sinner, but I am losing the light of Heaven, the glory of Heavenly converse, the most blessed privilege of the Christian's life on earth."

pp. 70-73.

From Eton, the Narrator proceeded to Cambridge; and among his college recollections occurs the following scene.

'One Saturday, when I had quitted his rooms for a few minutes, I found Sutherland on my return, not where I had left him, lying as usual on the sofa, but standing against one of the mullioned windows, and gazing upon the troops of students in their white surplices, who were flocking across the court in their way to chapel. To my astonishment, Sutherland was also in his surplice, but before I could speak, he said, with a quiet smile, "Now, I dare say you have a host of objections to urge; but indulge me, and let me go to chapel to-night. I know I am very ill, and I know you might say, I am not strong enough to go, but I have set my heart on going: the night is mild and pleasant, and I feel I shall be all the better for going. How often have I hurried thither half unwillingly as a task! but since I have been confined to these rooms and unable to go, I have learned to feel that I have been all the while slighting a high privilege. It is, perhaps, the last time," he continued, "and I wish once more to be with my fellow students, and to pray for them and for myself in the house of prayer, and in the house of God." "Listen," he said; and he threw open the casement: "what a grand, solemn swell from that magnificent organ. Come, Singleton, we shall be too late if we do not go immediately." He took my arm, and I did not oppose his wishes. Once or twice, during divine service, when I looked round at him, I saw the large tears stealing down his face. He was unable to kneel, but his thin hands were clasped together. Even in every pause of the service, he seemed intently occupied in prayer.

'We lingered in the ante-chapel till the crowd was gone, and while the chapel-clerk was putting out the tapers in the chapel, Sutherland went and sat at a little distance from the splendid statue of Sir Isaac Newton. The ghost-like whiteness of the statue stood out clear and distinct in the moon-light, and the same soft light fell partially on the upraised countenance of Sutherland, and the loose and flowing folds of his surplice. His shining eyes were turned toward the statue, and he seemed deep in thought. "I have been thinking", he said, "that this" (pointing to the statue) "has been rather the god of my devotion, or I may say of my idolatry since my coming hither, than the eternal Being to whom this house of prayer is consecrated." Then, after a pause he continued, "The spirit that possessed me lately, would have made me lament, when taking my last look of this glorious

statue, that sickness was carrying me to an untimely grave, and that I should die unknown and unnoticed, and be soon forgotten; but God has been very merciful, and given me a better spirit, a spirit of content—may I not hope, that sweet spirit of adoption of which you say the old fathers of the church of England often speak? I have no such desponding feelings now. I lament no longer that I am forbidden to be distinguished in this world. There was not in me the humble mind of the good and great man whose statue is before us. Do not think, dear Singleton, that I would depreciate the mighty efforts of genius, that I underrate the wisdom of man; but I had long forgotten the fountain of all true wisdom. I had been satisfied with the streams. Now, my friend, I thirst for that fountain, the spring-head not only of wisdom, but of happiness and life.” pp. 108—110.

We cannot refrain from transcribing the following admirable sentiments.

‘I cannot help thinking, that many of the most pious and holy of the present day, want one lovely grace to their edified and edifying characters. They cannot, or do not make allowance for the slow growth of others. They do not see how impossible it is for an individual, who has been brought up among persons of worldly views, and yet of moral and honourable principles, to discover very quickly the radical error of all that is merely moral, merely honourable in the professed disciples of Jesus Christ; and how very possible it is for such an individual to have made great advancement, at least in sincerity of purpose and spirituality of mind, without having gained any acquaintance with the conventional terms and usages of the religious world. It is at the same time fearfully easy for one brought up in a religious set, to acquire the language, and indeed *all* that may be taught by man, of the religion he professes; and the natural effect and consequence of all such acquirement without the Spirit, is to create a feeling of self-approval and of imaginary superiority over more spiritual, but less fluent professors.

‘Some of the most interesting characters I have ever known, have been those that were brought up away from a religious party; and I have heard a very holy man declare, that he ever felt deeply interested in such persons, in assisting the formation and development of their characters, in removing the awkwardness of their spiritual gait, and correcting the blunders of their mode of expressing themselves. Besides, after all, nothing is more charming than to find a very holy and spiritual person without the cant of conventional expressions.

‘I wish I could see in religious professors more of the winning kindness that distinguished our only perfect exemplar. How constrained has many an ingenuous and well-disposed person been made to feel, by the manner which can speak as plainly as words, in saying, you are not to be admitted to familiar intercourse with us, for you are not an initiated person! Where is the love and condescension of our blessed Lord, who loved the young ruler, although he could not consent to make the sacrifice that Christ required, and follow Him.

‘How ought we to esteem those who have all the amiable qualities of

that young man, and are also ready to give up all for their Lord, but who are, alas ! ignorant or inexperienced in the outward expression of the faith of Christ.

‘ A sure proof that the religion of Jesus Christ is in the heart, is not only to see a pure, holy, denying spirit where self is concerned ; not only to find new views, and new life, and new works ; but to find also, a lovely, never-failing charity towards others, towards those even whom we think mistaken in doctrine, or worse than mistaken in practice ; to see that their errors and transgressions are used tenderly and compassionately, rather than bitterly, so that by the comparison, if any be unconsciously made, no such self-approving opinion is ever generated, as that of the Pharisee ; “ Lord, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, or even as this publican.” O Lord ! enable me to dread a notional religion. We know, by many fearful instances, it is possible to hold the truth, or something very like the truth, in ungodliness. What, however, is unsanctified knowledge or unsanctified wisdom ? The most distinguished among men, either in the one or the other, stands like a babe, nay a very fool beside Him who, though fallen, is an angel fallen, who hath visited the secret chamber of every human heart that ever existed ; through whose infernal wiles it was, that the world by wisdom know not God.

‘ I have often observed the transforming effect of vital religion on a common-place character. It imparts at once, a sort of intellectual originality, as well as a moral superiority. Many persons have I met become, by the grace of God, holy believers and faithful disciples of our Lord, persons whom I remembered as barely endurable in society, talking of the weather, or politics, or the usages of society, or on literary subjects, in a trite and even tamely wearying manner ; the same persons whom I could sit and listen to in delighted silence. Even humanly speaking, the cause of this change may be easily traced : the intellect has been expanded, the feelings simplified in the man, by the grandeur and simplicity of the new object to which the intellect and the feelings have been directed.—Lord ! I would be really wise ; rouse me from my lukewarmness, and enable me to seek this wisdom as silver, to search for her as for treasures ; for then only shall I understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God. It is indeed by praying and supplicating with diligence and perseverance, that we attain this wisdom, and abide in it ; or all other attempts will prove but vain. How many poor souls, otherwise weak and simple, have by this means grown exceedingly wise in the mystery of Godliness !’

In the ‘ Envoy ’ to the reader, Mr. Tayler thus apologises for having made use of fiction in defending the doctrines and rites of the Church of which he is the minister.

‘ I am aware, that this volume may be called a novel, and I wish to say a word or two about novels.—I am ready to join with many Christian moralists in their disapprobation of novels, for this reason,—many of the best-written novels, and those abounding in the bright display and high commendation of virtue, ought to be objectionable in that which professes to be the society of Christians, for they are almost

certain to mislead, in a way not the less dangerous, because it wears all the specious shew and colouring of the fruits of holy principle. They describe persons and characters, who become more and more faultless, and more and more happy, as the history advances, no one knows why, but because the author chooses to make them so.—They speak of positive and practical effects, as proceeding from the motive of a mere wish, or the principle of an idly formed resolution, made and kept in the might and constancy of man's own strength ;—or I should say, they describe effects, without shewing the only springs of such effects. They dress out a bramble with the rich and clustering fruit of the vine.

‘ Dr. Chalmers has well said, “ So much for the dream of fancy. Let us compare it with the waking images of truth. Walk from Dan to Beersheba, and tell us, if without and beyond the operation of gospel motives and gospel principle, the reality of life ever furnished you with a picture that is at all like the elegance and perfection of this fictitious history. Go to the finest specimen of such a family ; take your secret stand, and observe them in their more retired and invisible movements. It is not enough to pay them a ceremonious visit, and observe them in the put-on manners and holiday dress of general company ; look at them when all this disguise and finery are thrown aside. Yes, we have no doubt that you will perceive some love, some tenderness, some virtue ; but the rough and untutored honesty of truth compels us to say, that along with all this, there are at times mingled the bitterness of invective, the growlings of discontent, the harpings of peevishness and animosity, and all that train of angry, suspicious, and discordant feelings, which embitter the heart of man, and make the reality of human life a very sober affair indeed, when compared with the high colouring of romance, and the sentimental extravagance of poetry. Now what do we make of all this ? We infer, that however much we may love perfection, and aspire after it, yet there is some want, some disease in the constitution of man, which prevents his attainment to it—that there is a feebleness of principle about him—that the energy of his practice does not correspond to the fair promises of his fancy—and however much he may delight in an ideal scene of virtue and moral excellence, there is some lurking malignity in his constitution, which, without the operation of that mighty power revealed to us in the Gospel, makes it vain to wish, and hopeless to aspire after.”

‘ Thus, I may add, the reader is misled. He thinks a wish can make him happy, a resolution virtuous. He is, perhaps, full of the lively admiration of virtue and excellence, but his admiration evaporates with the mere glow of fine feeling. The effect of this unsoundness in principle is unsoundness in practice. He is neither strengthened, established, nor settled in what is right and good, but is (as almost a sure consequence) inconsistent, and acquires the reputation of being romantic and visionary, and perhaps unfit for common life.—Either make the tree sound, and the fruit sweet, or the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt.

‘ Now let an author shew things as they really are—expose the flimsy character of such surface virtue ; let him allude continually to the existence of principles. Let him shew that there is but one plant

that can bear the fruit which he describes. It is indeed the luxuriant garlands of the vine alone, that are hung with the beautiful and gladdening grape. The temper and habits of the Christian are all from one plant, and whatever the Father hath not planted shall be rooted up.

‘Whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are honest, lovely, true, or of good report, all are from one principle alone. What! cannot we have virtue, you say, lauded, and impressed, and recommended, without religious principle always being brought forward? Yes; if you choose to give up your profession of Christianity; but to Christian readers, in a professed Christian world, surely never such principles can be acknowledged. Let an author remember this, and his readers will never be misled; and though I am by no means an advocate for the too common practice of the present day, the very frequent reading of works of fiction, even those works which, without doing any moral injury to the heart, must enervate the powers of the mind, and create a distaste for deep and more manly reading—let an author remember this, and though a writer of poetry or fiction, he may take his place with humble confidence among the real advocates of sound righteousness, among the true benefactors of mankind.’ pp. 353—357.

The fictions of such a writer can hardly fail to be truth.

‘*Shades of Character*’ by the late Mrs. Woodrooffe, has but recently fallen into our hands: but we are not surprised at the popularity which it has obtained. The title is amply justified by the discrimination which is shewn in the delineation and development of character, by means, not of mere description, but of familiar and natural dialogue. The work is as regular a novel as can consist with the fact that there is not a single love-scene in the whole story; and it is at the same time as replete with religious instruction, without theological pedantry, as Mrs. More’s *Cœlebs*. Nothing can be more excellent than the sentiments conveyed, and the general moral of the tale; and reserving our objections against the class of works to which these volumes belong, we cannot hesitate to give them all the benefit of our cordial recommendation. We shall give a single extract, as a specimen of the cleverness with which the dialogue is sustained: we regret, however, that it is sometimes a little too colloquial, nor is the style free from verbal improprieties.

‘It was to James a season of joy—joy long expected: and yet the day was so gloomy, and Agnes was so low, that he could not believe it was the hour of felicity—Not to weary the reader with more of this than is necessary, they drove off; and Agnes lifted the pad which covered the glass at the back of the carriage, to get a last look at her dear Elizabeth, and the rectory. James said nothing; the ride was silent and almost sad. As they drew near the village of Abberley, they heard the bell tolling. “Dear!” said Agnes, “there is some one dead. I wonder who it is?” James was inwardly fretted. That the bells should not ring, when he brought his darling home, was to

him a disappointment ; but that they should toll on so joyful an occasion, was, he thought, most unpleasant ; and he handed his dear girl from the chaise in silence.

‘ The quiet form of Aunt Groves was gliding through the hall to meet her child ; and “ The Lord bless thee, my beloved ! ” passed from her maternal lip.

‘ As soon as they were seated in the library, Uncle James came behind, and took off her hat. “ Dear me, you have pulled down all my hair.” “ Well child ; go up stairs, and dress.”

‘ She rose with animation to obey. “ You kind Uncle ; I will directly.” She left the room.

‘ Mr. James. “ My dear aunt, was there ever any thing so *mal-à-propos* ? Did you hear that bell tolling ? ”

‘ Mrs. E. Groves. “ I did.”

‘ Mr. James. “ It was very badly managed.”

‘ Mrs. E. Groves. “ Edward James, mortals must give way to immortals. Poor clerk passed to his final state this morning.”

‘ Mr. James. “ Poor old fellow ! I did not think he would have gone so soon.”

‘ Mrs. E. Groves. “ No, my dear. He had a stroke on Friday last, final and decisive. Yet he lingered till this morning.—Are you superstitious, Edward James ? ”

‘ Mr. James. “ Me ? Oh, dear, no.”

‘ Mrs. E. Groves. “ Because you seem to make such a point of the bells ringing when our Agnes returned ; and appeared so put out that they should toll.”

‘ Mr. James. “ I thought it disrespectful ; and on that account I regretted that you opposed their being rung. And without being superstitious, my dear aunt, I must say, there is something very disagreeable in the heavy toll of a bell on such an occasion. I would have every thing gay ; birds singing, roses blowing, soft air breathing, every face dressed in smiles, and all in holiday clothes.”

‘ Mrs. E. Groves. “ Edward, this is very kind of you.”

‘ She paused, for Agnes came in.

‘ Mr. James. “ Well, this is as it should be, Agnes. Now it looks like July.”

‘ Mrs. E. Groves. “ My love, Agnes, poor Cole is dead ; he died this morning.”

‘ Agnes. “ What was his complaint, Aunt ? ”

‘ Mrs. E. Groves. “ Palsy, my dear.”

‘ Mr. James. “ How is it, Madam, that this disease is so frequent in our day ? ”

‘ Mrs. E. Groves. “ I suppose there is some defect in our food : perhaps we drink too much tea ; or wear the nervous system by late hours, and too great mental excitement. This has certainly been the case with Mr. N. ; for the departed, I know not that we can tax him with any imprudence ; we can only say, it is the way in which it has pleased God to dismiss him.”

‘ Agnes. “ I hope, Aunt, Mr. Wilton saw him ? ”

‘ Mrs. E. Groves. “ O, yes, my dear, every day.”

‘ Agnes. “ Any thing satisfactory, Aunt ? ”

' *Mrs. E. Groves.* "Not particularly, my love."

' *Mr. James.* "Poor old creature! I pity the widow; I think I shall go and see her; [turning short as he was going out of the door.] Agnes, child, I hope that bell-tolling did not depress your spirits?"

' *Mrs. E. Groves.* [Looking very earnestly at him.] "My dear, who is Agnes Groves, that she is never to hear a bell toll? Do not spoil a child who is really disposed to modesty and humility. So far from viewing this circumstance as unfavourable on her first entrance here, I think it may prove of the greatest use to her."

' *Mr. James.* "I really cannot see it in that light."

' *Agnes.* "I can, uncle. I understand my aunt completely."

' She rose, and fondly slipping her arm within his, led him up and down the library. "Shall I tell you?"

' *Mr. James.* "Yes, if you will."

' *Agnes.* "She thinks her Agnes very likely to be spoiled by a kind uncle, and many more indulgent friends; she thinks it probable she may look too low for happiness; and the tolling of that bell may serve to remind her that this is not her rest."

' *Mr. James.* "Child, why don't you hold your head up? Do you think it necessary to stoop to me? or is it a mere act of condescension, whilst you are informing my judgment? If so, condescend no more; but let me see if you are grown since we parted."

' *Agnes.* "There uncle; [drawing herself to her full height.] There, you see."

' *Mr. James.* "Well, my dear, you are quite tall enough, so that will do; and I will go and see this poor woman."

' "What a dear excellent creature that is, Aunt Groves!" said Agnes, as she saw him pass the window. "He is one that does good by stealth, and blushes to find it fame." "My love, I differ from you; but I should not express this difference, were it not for your sake, Agnes. I do not wish you to get a taste for an extreme of secrecy, even in the kind acts you perform. We are to 'let our light shine before men;' certainly not for our own glory: but there is danger in this studied secrecy. There is danger of our attaching to it some idea of merit. You would see no peculiar beauty in slighting the commands of your dear earthly friends openly, and in secretly performing them; let all your conduct be natural, Agnes. When once obedience to God is your delight, you will no longer think of the opinion of man." "But is there not a text, my dear Aunt, 'Let not your left hand know what your right hand doeth?'" "Undoubtedly; and I think it is like many other texts, a guard against the opposite extreme. Your dear uncle James is a most improving character; but this feature is so strong in him, that his originality appears in every act; and though in him we expect it, for us to imitate would be both awkward and affected. We have but one safe model, and that is our Saviour. Let us endeavour, my child, to follow him earnestly and sincerely. I remember an observation of a wise and pious friend of mine, that in Jesus nothing was prominent; no excellence pre-eminent but goodness. He was *remarkable* for nothing. Every attribute of his character was in harmony, and none predominated."

Art. VI. *Idolatry*; a Poem in Five Parts. By the Rev. William Swan, Missionary at Selenginsk. Part V. 12mo. pp. 68. Glasgow. 1832.

WE hope that the time will come round in which the poet shall again stand a fair chance of being listened to, if he 'charm wisely;' when manly sentiment, and sterling sense, and natural description, such as gave to the poetry of Cowper at one time its charm and its authority, will redeem verse from the depreciation and powerlessness into which it appears to have sunk; when readers will again have leisure to feel and to sympathize, and to cultivate those sentiments which are of slow growth, but which alone bear the purest pleasures. We should regard it as a most encouraging indication of a return to a healthy state of public feeling, were Cowper as much read, and as frequently cited, as Lord Byron. But the fact is, the age is too busy to think, and, amid the din of the ten thousand wheels of the world's machinery, has no ear for music, no heart for poetry. That we are not slandering the times, the state of general literature will, we think, sufficiently evince. Yet, surely, those lose much who do not sometimes allow themselves to be conducted to the higher elevations of thought, which are above the reach of the grosser atmosphere. The style of thought proper to poetry, and which is the essence of poetry, is one that is adapted to soothe the restlessness of the passions, as well as to refine the sentiments; and we know of no substitute for it. Poetry is so natural to the mind as a mode of thought, that the feelings, when in a healthy and vigorous state, will always be susceptible of poetical influence. The love of nature, the domestic sentiments, philosophic or devout meditation, all find their most appropriate expression in the language of poetry; and where this language is foreign to the feelings, it indicates that a certain kind of mental cultivation has been neglected, which is requisite to the complete formation of the character.

But is *Idolatry* a subject for poetry? What else is the grand theme, the staple material, of all that is deemed classical in ancient poetry? *Idolatry* is the very religion of imagination, and poets have been its priests. But when a Christian Missionary chooses such a theme, he may seem to invade 'the region of the loves and the luxuries,' only as an iconoclast,—a ruthless violator of the fanes consecrated by art and venerable prescription. It is so; and yet, Mr. Swan has sufficiently shewn in the former Parts of his poem, that Truth is able to foil fiction with its own weapons, and that the simplest tones of the harp of prophecy are of more genuine inspiration than the music of Orpheus himself. All figure apart, Mr. Swan has chosen a subject which Cowper had already touched with a master hand, but only incidentally, so as to encourage the attempt to exhibit it more distinctly in all

its horrid lineaments, for the purpose of deepening impressions of its true character. This has been the Author's purpose, worthy of the sacred character which he bears; and 'for the sake of this, he will be well content,' he says, 'to bear the self-complacent sneer of the men whose taste is too refined—or not refined enough—for such things.' Contempt, Mr. Swan can hardly have to fear. His poetry must command the approbation of those whom it may fail to move or to delight. It describes what the Author has seen, reports what he knows to be true, expresses no feigned or sickly feelings, but being evidently inspired by the purest and most elevated sentiments of the heart, makes an eloquent appeal to the heart of the reader. The former portion of the poem of which this is the concluding part, was noticed by us on its first appearance. It is written in the Spenserian stanza, the best, perhaps, that could have been adopted, but to manage which with uniform felicity, so as to satisfy the fastidious ear, requires a very practised and skilful hand. Mr. Swan has evidently been sometimes more intent on communicating his sentiments and feelings, than on polishing his lines. And yet, his versification is, upon the whole, smooth, flowing, and energetic, though not straining with the intensity of energy. Our readers shall, however, judge for themselves, both of his talent for description and his skill in versification.

XXVIII.

'—The traveller o'er India's sultry plains,
Sees in the north a filmy cloud of light,
Skirting th' horizon.—Day by day he gains
Upon it.—What is there?—Lo! calmly bright,
The snowy mountains towering in their height,
Above the storms of time that roll beneath!—
No path is there—nor soaring birds alight
On those eternal snows. No sound—no breath
Is heard! There all is cold and motionless as death!

XXIX.

'Kingdoms are at their feet, and from their sides
Rush rivers that those kingdoms fertilize;
Their shadow points to Lassa, where resides
A man—a god in his fond votaries' eyes.
And they are found from hence, where rivers rise,
Far as these roll their many-branching streams;
And, as yon sky-invading ridge defies
The sun to melt its snows—the lama deems
That he has nought to fear from truth's directest beams.

XXX.

'Tis time—full time the experiment were tried;
He gathers courage by our long delay;—

Nor is he idle while we stand aside,
But o'er new realms extends his ghostly sway ;
And drains their wealth as well as faith away.'

* * * * *

XLII.

' But of the scatter'd family of man,
Behold another tribe!—the outskirts of the world
Their home—inhabitable, proud Japan :—
Unknown until the mountain waves that curl'd
Their heads round Pinta's bark, him headlong hurl'd
Upon her shores. Then first that tempting mine
Of wealth was open'd, and then first unfurl'd
Their flags, the prows that ploughed the brine,
From distant Europe, where Truth own'd her fairest shrine.

XLIII.

' The merchants crowded to the new-found strand ;
And Missionaries hied with cross and bead,
And soon was reckon'd there a numerous band
Of converts—but, of course, the Romish breed :
And whether they were " wholly a right seed,"
One day will show.—Yet, from a root unsound,
'Twere hard to credit that there could proceed
Fair trees of righteousness, on which were found
Such fruits as made Japan's plantations holy ground.

XLIV.

' But the bears came, and tore up branch and root,
And made those fields a wilderness again ;
God will'd not that that tribe should kiss the foot
Of Rome, and reverence her saintly train.
His majesty, whose right it is to reign,
Must be asserted there in other form,—
And what if, o'er the island-studded main,
Some voyager, hurried by another storm,
May to a paradise that land of weeds transform.'

* * * * *

LXXIII.

' —There the Cordilleras their white heads raise ;—
A sea of clouds breaks on their mighty sides,
As ocean's self beats harmless at their base.
Their lengthen'd ridge a continent divides—
Their snows the source of many a stream that glides
In various volume to the distant main :
The Condor, nested in their crags, derides
The mortals he sees toiling on the plain,
Digging with bloody hands for base, unholy gain.

LXXIV.

' Woe to the Incas—woe to their Peru,
 When a Pizarro to that land was led !
 Surely that day the sun his light withdrew,
 And left his votaries to their speechless dread,
 Who, ere their rites were done, the altars fled ;—
 But why ?—These Spaniards bear the holy cross,
 And that bless'd sign will there erect, instead
 Of Idol vanities and symbols gross—
 And God's will be the gain—and hell's will be the loss.

LXXV.

' Vain fantasy !—where'er th' invader's foot
 Brush'd off the dew, it left a bloody stain—
 Why—they were sportsmen !—and as sportsmen shoot
 The golden-plumaged bird, nor heed its pain,
 If they can but the shining spoil obtain—
 So that inhuman crew their cross adorn'd,
 First with the Inca's head—then with the chain
 They forged for his Peruvians, who mourn'd
 Their fallen chief, and wore a yoke their spirits scorn'd !

LXXVI.

' But now that chain is rotting, and the limbs
 It bound, erewhile, are struggling to be free—
 And he who now the Andes' summits climbs,
 Could he survey the land from sea to sea,
 Might count how few are left who bow the knee
 To their oppressors ; and from that proud height,
 Perceive the spreading boughs of Freedom's tree—
 The clouds retiring, and Religion's light,
 Calm rising through the gloom—and shining still more bright.'

* * * * *

CXIV.

' —But hush !—here comes a Persian ; his air
 Is mild but noble, and his meaning eye
 Bespeaks an audience.—Some deep-brooding care
 He would reveal, is prefaced by that sigh—
 " Speak, Persian ! thou hast gain'd our sympathy ;
 We would assuage, or share thy sorrows deep ;
 Our hearts acknowledge the mysterious tie
 That binds us, for we, too, can sigh and weep ;
 And, giving words to grief, thou mayest some comfort reap."

CXV.

' —" The first of men—too sacred is his name
 For his mean slave to utter—too revered
 To be forgotten—from your country came.

He was the sun that gladden'd us, and clear'd
The mists of ignorance, which disappear'd
Before the light of wisdom he display'd ;
And only they who loved their darkness fear'd
His beam. But him, God to his heaven convey'd,
And left Shiraz to mourn the night his absence made.

CXVI.

“ But of such men of God could Britain yield
But one? Or is the well of charity
Dried up? Or must alone our Persian field,
Of all the world, be pass'd neglected by?
Whence your chang'd purpose and averted eye?—
Your former gift has doubled our distress,
For now we know—we feel—our misery.
O that your kindness had been *more* or *less*!
That *him* we had not known, or *like him* still might bless!”

CXVII.

— Now let our deeds show what our bosoms feel ;
Surely for MARTYN's sake, and for our own,
We will bestir ourselves at this appeal.—
We cannot raise a monumental stone,
To mark where lies his honour'd head—unknown
His earthly resting place—but we may tell,
He was not friendless, though he died alone ;
And some who caught his mantle as it fell,
May prove that MARTYN's faith and spirit in them dwell.’

These stanzas may be suffered to speak for themselves. If the poetry might occasionally have gained polish from a more sedulous revision, there is no deficiency of poetical feeling. The conception is, perhaps, superior to the execution ; the material to the workmanship ; but the sentiment is every way worthy of the subject. We must make room for the following touching stanzas.

CXXXVIII.

‘ We will not praise the living, and the dead
Seek not the plaudits of a mortal's tongue :
But when a Christian soldier bows his head,
And dies, should not the solemn harp be strung,
And emblem laurels round his hearse be hung ?
If “ Jesus wept,” will he forbid a tear,
When for a friend beloved our hearts are wrung ?
No, when the “ man of sorrows ” sojourn'd here,
He join'd the mourners met around a brother's bier.’

CXXXIX.

' Now from his glorious throne he bends his eye
 Of mercy and compassion, on his few
 And mourning followers. He marks the sigh
 Of the bereaved heart, and points the view
 To heavenly scenes, from which his own hand drew
 Aside the curtain. In that blissful seat
 Is heard salvation's song for ever new—
 There saints adore at their Redeemer's feet,
 And fruits of glory taste, and living waters sweet !

CXL.

' We will not praise the living, but the dead
 We will remember with "the joy of grief,"
 Their memory shall be fragrant, and their bed
 Of dust be sacred ; and we'll track their brief
 But bright ascent to glory.—Sweet relief
 Amidst our toils, to think how soon we'll soar
 And meet them all again !—They wav'd the sheaf
 Of first fruits reap'd on many a foreign shore ;
 They saw and bless'd the sight—and lo, their toils were o'er !

CXLI.

' What are the living but the future dead ?
 Let us who are the living think of this.—
 Upon the ashes of our friends we tread,
 Who have already reach'd the land of bliss,
 —The mark we aim at, which we shall not miss
 If we like them for Christ the world forego,
 And from our hearts its blandishments dismiss,
 Preferring things above to things below :
 All we can suffer here is short-enduring woe.'

To those readers who already possess the former publication, it can scarcely be necessary to recommend the present Part. We shall be happy to see the whole poem reprinted ; and in the mean time would recommend to Mr. Swan to spare no pains in its diligent revision.

NOTICES.

- Art. VII. 1. *The Evidences of Christianity*: stated in a Popular and Practical manner, in a Course of Lectures. By Daniel Wilson, M.A. Second Edition. 12mo. 2 Vols. Price 9s. London. 1832.
2. *Hints on the Portable Evidence of Christianity*. By Joseph John Gurney. 18mo. pp. 183. Price 2s. London. 1832.

WE notice with great satisfaction this very neat and cheap edition of Mr. Wilson's Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity, reviewed in our January Number. To the strong recommendation of the work to our readers, which we felt it our duty to express, we need add nothing, except the hope that, in this portable form, the work will become more extensively useful. The volumes will form a very suitable and valuable present to young persons.

Mr. Gurney's little volume supplies a *desideratum*, by furnishing those classes for whom useful and entertaining knowledge has been of late so largely provided, with an outline of the internal evidence of Christianity. It invites their attention more particularly to 'some of those proofs of the truth of our holy religion which lie immediately before us, and which, where the Bible is freely circulated, are within the reach of every serious and reflecting mind.' The subject, Mr. Gurney remarks, naturally divides itself into two parts. 'In the first place, the Bible, considered alone, affords, in the purity, dignity, harmony, and practical importance of its contents, sufficient evidence of its Divine origin. And secondly, the accordance of the truths revealed in Scripture with what we know in ourselves, and observe in the world around us, and more especially the adaptation of the Gospel of Christ to the condition of fallen man, supplies us with a further conclusive proof, that the Creator and Moral Governor of the universe is the Author of the Bible.' The contents of the work are accordingly arranged under these two heads:—Part I. THE BIBLE CONSIDERED ALONE. § 1. On the Excellence of Scripture, and on the Accordance of its Parts. 2. On Prophecy compared with History. 3. On the Supreme Being. 4. On the Moral Law. 5. On the Example of Christ. 6. On the general Account of the Saviour. 7. On the Father, the Son, and the Spirit—one God. Part II. THE BIBLE COMPARED WITH EXPERIENCE. § 1. On a Future Life. 2. On the Moral Government of God. 3. On the Sinful and Enslaved Condition of Man. 4. On Repentance and Mediation. 5. On the Fitness of the Scheme of Redemption. 6. Conclusion. The plan of the work is simple and comprehensive, and the sentiments are strictly evangelical, as those readers will not require to be informed, who are acquainted with Mr. Gurney's former publications*. As coming from a

* Mr. Gurney's "Essays on the Evidences, Doctrines, and Practical Operation of Christianity", (8vo, 1825,) is an admirable work, of which we should be pleased to see a cheap edition, with some slight modifications. See Ecl. Rev. 2d Series, vol. xxv. p. 289.

layman, it may, perhaps, be received by many persons with less prejudice; and we cannot but ardently wish that it may obtain an extensive circulation among the classes, for which, more especially, it has been benevolently designed. Although it cannot be necessary to give any specimen of such a work, we are tempted to extract the following truly excellent remarks.

‘What then is the conclusion to which a comprehensive view of Scriptural truth inevitably leads? It is that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are essentially and eternally ONE.

‘The distinction to which the Scriptures bear testimony as subsisting in the Deity, is so far from undermining the doctrine of oneness, that it imparts to that doctrine a fresh energy and a peculiar glory. Certain it is, that where the unity of God is admitted, and this distinction is nevertheless denied, as among the Mahometans and modern Jews, religion loses much of its practical influence and vital power. Yet while the Christian rejoices in the distinct characters and offices of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, so graciously revealed to us for our instruction and edification, he probably never finds his soul bowed down with so deep a reverence, or filled with so pure a delight, as when he contemplates the Almighty as an ineffable glory—an incommunicable name—an infinite and incomprehensible UNITY.

‘We must now apply these remarks to the argument before us. Were that union and distinction in divine nature, which is so plainly declared in Scripture, contrary to reason—that is, *naturally impossible*—we should be driven to the conclusion, that the Bible is so far from being the book of God, that it can be ascribed only to ignorant and erring man. But God is an infinite and unsearchable Being, and the least degree of reflection may suffice to satisfy us, that there is nothing which reason can disprove in the doctrine of Scripture, that in a certain respect he is THREE, and in another respect, ONE.

‘Yet that doctrine is *beyond* reason—far out of the reach of our intellectual powers; and this is the very ground on which we hail it as another internal evidence of the divine origin of the Holy Scripture. While it bears upon us with a native strength and harmony which plainly indicate its truth, and while, when rightly understood, it is found to be full of unutterable blessings for our fallen race, it relates to the unfathomable secrets of the divine nature, and could not possibly have been discovered by the unassisted discernment of man. To whom then can we ascribe the revelation of this doctrine, but to the Supreme Being himself?

‘It is not, however, to the fact of its revelation only, but also to the manner in which it is revealed, that we may safely make our appeal. The Father, the Son, and the Spirit are presented to us in the Scriptures as severally God, and as the distinct objects of our faith; and at the same time we are perpetually reminded by the sacred writers that God is ONE. Yet these writers offer no apology whatsoever for this apparent diversity of statement; nor do they make the slightest attempt to explain the mode in which these truths consist. The most mysterious of all doctrines is revealed in their writings with a perfect simplicity; and on the apparent presumption, that no

doubts could be entertained, and no casuistry exercised, on the subject.

‘How different would have been the case, had the Scriptures been written by some of those theological speculators who have since handled the same subject, in their own wisdom and strength. What scholastic refinements, what apologies for apparent difficulties, what nice distinctions, what extraordinary terms, would have been imposed on their readers !

‘In the Bible, all is simple, powerful, and practical. While enough is hidden to humble us under a sense of our own ignorance, enough is revealed to direct our faith and to regulate our conduct ; and the very mode in which the light shines upon us, affords a substantial evidence that it is the light of heaven.’ pp. 67—69.

Art. VIII. *On Scriptural Education in Ireland.* A Letter from the Rev. James Carlile, of Dublin, one of the Commissioners of the Board of Education in London ; containing some remarks on the Speech of Capt. J. E. Gordon, M.P. at Exeter Hall. 8vo. pp. 16. Price 4d. London.

WHATEVER objections may be fairly urged against the ministerial measure for the promotion of education in Ireland, there can be no question that the clamour raised against the Government, is chiefly instigated by political animosity, and maintained by the basest misrepresentation. The statements made by the great Protestant Agitator, the Member for Dundalk, is characterised by Mr. Carlile as forming ‘one of those portentous examples of which the present day is so fertile, of persons professing zeal for religion, manifesting nearly as little regard to truth and decency in prosecuting their measures, as the most unscrupulous of the opponents of religion.’ Mr. Carlile’s Letter will unmask, by a simple statement of facts, the true features of this Anti-Catholic zeal : we must transcribe a few paragraphs, reserving for a future occasion any remarks of our own.

‘Much clamour has been raised about our taking away the Scriptures from Protestants, and refusing them to Roman Catholics. The fact stands thus:—In the first place, we take away the Scriptures from no school whatever ; because we have no power to interfere with any school till its conductors, of their own accord, make application to us. In the next place, if the conductors of a school who wish the Scriptures to be read, apply to us, we suggest to them to assemble those children whose parents desire that they should read the Scriptures, before the regular hour of school business, or to detain them after it, the hours being left to their own determination ; when they will be at full liberty to do as they choose in that respect : that we direct them not to introduce the Scriptures during hours which are appropriated to the common branches of education, because their doing so would exclude children from the benefit of education, whose parents are averse to their reading the Scriptures without interpretation ; and in the mean while, we are preparing such extracts from Scripture as will fur-

nish to all the children a large portion of scriptural knowledge ; and which being recommended by the Board, consisting partly of persons in whom Roman Catholics have confidence, will be received by many who would not consent to read the authorized version. The Government plan lays no obstacle of any importance in the way of any children reading the Scriptures, whose parents do, *bonâ fide*, desire that they should read them. But most of the Protestant education institutions attempt to compel Roman Catholic children to read the Bible, under the penalty of forfeiting the whole education afforded by them. Now this appears to me a most pernicious system. The consequence has been, that although a considerable number, as it would appear, of Roman Catholic children, have, under these circumstances, attended the Kildare-place Schools, no healing influence has flowed from them over the face of the country. The two parties are, perhaps, at the present moment, more embittered than they ever were. The very Bible, placed in such a position, fails to produce its proper effects. The reading of it is viewed as part of a price paid for education ; while no explanation of it being permitted, no application of it made to the consciences of the children, no prayer accompanying it, the enlightening, purifying, elevating, healing influences of it are totally lost. The Bible is thus converted into a party book, and the reading of it into a party symbol ; and thus the very food which a merciful God has provided for the souls of men, has, in this country, been converted into the gall of asps.

‘ You may wonder at the loud and apparently general outcry that is made in Ireland against us. I shall endeavour to explain some portion of it :—In the *first* place, there is a party who would not consent to the circulation of the whole Bible by the Board, so long as there is a Roman Catholic upon it, or any other whose religious principles they do not approve ; among these, I believe, is Mr. Gordon himself, who has seceded from the Bible Society on these principles ; so that nothing would satisfy him and his party, but the education of Ireland being placed in their own hands. *Secondly*, there is a party who would not be satisfied with the introduction of the whole Bible into the Schools, unless the Board consisted exclusively of members of the Established Church : this is manifest also from their having kept aloof from the Bible Society ever since its establishment, avowedly because it receives Dissenters on an equal footing with members of the Establishment. *Thirdly*, there is a party who will be satisfied with no system of education, with or without the Scriptures, which comes forth under the auspices of the present Administration. This is evident from their mingling the subject of education with that of reform, of tithes, and other subjects which have no connexion, except as they are viewed in connexion with the measures of the present ministry. Nothing, I should suppose, could have induced noblemen and gentlemen of high character to submit arguments respecting the Bible and Scriptural Education to assemblies of Orangemen, amidst a display of party flags, and an accompaniment of party tunes, which have long been signals for strife and bloodshed, but their conceiving that they were making out a case against the present Government. *Fourthly*, There is a party who are stimulated by an hereditary antipathy to Roman Catho-

lies, and who are enraged beyond measure to see a Roman Catholic prelate sitting as a member of a Board, acting under the directions of Government, or any Roman Catholic aiding in the disbursement of the public funds. *Fifthly*, There is a large party who do not think for themselves, but who have been misled by the exaggerated and distorted representations of these four parties; a good specimen of which you have in Mr. Gordon's speech. These will decrease as the truth becomes known. Any one of these causes of hostility might blind the judgement of a strong man; but when a man is under the influence of several of them at the same moment, you cannot wonder at the extreme violence and extravagance which some have manifested. *Sixthly*, After all these are accounted for, there is a remnant of highly estimable persons, some of whom decidedly dissent from the Government plan, others of whom stand in doubt about it; and it has been one of the severest trials of steadfastness to principle that I have ever undergone, that I have felt myself compelled to adopt, and to persevere in, a course which such persons disapprove of. I would not, however, by any means be understood as intimating that I stand alone among those with whom I have been accustomed to co-operate. There are many eminently pious individuals with me, both here and in Britain. I trust my motives are simple and scriptural. If they be otherwise, I pray that God may open mine eyes to my error, and direct me to a course of conduct more consonant to His will. I have no interest in continuing with the Board, but duty to the Government of the country, in lending them my best assistance in prosecuting what I conceive to be not only a lawful, but a wise and just measure, and the hope of promoting the peace and well-being of a people who have too long been subjected to a treatment which, in every point, has outraged the first principles of christianity. At a time when the legitimate authorities of the empire are bearded and threatened by two opposite factions, equally unscrupulous in their measures, and equally regardless of bloodshed, I would not, for all my worldly interests, assume an attitude towards them that might be construed into coldness or disrespect.'

'The whole of Mr. Gordon's reasonings upon the number of Roman Catholics reading the Scriptures are, as it appears to me, founded upon the most palpable fallacies. In the first place, he would have his hearers and readers to suppose, that all the children attending the Kildare-place schools read the Scriptures. He forgets that only the upper class do so; that the upper class forms but a small proportion of any school; and that multitudes of Roman Catholics who, under various influences, are entered in these schools, are withdrawn before they reach the upper class; many of them, I believe, purposely to avoid it. He argues also, that, because societies supported by voluntary contributions have succeeded in inducing Roman Catholic parents to permit their children to read the Scriptures, the same societies, supported by government grants, would produce the same effects. Here, again, he is deceived. If any one of the societies alluded to by him were to receive a government grant, its whole character, internal and external, would be changed, and would be instantly exposed to the same opposition which the Kildare-place Society met with, and which,

with regard to any beneficial effect produced upon Roman Catholics, rendered that society a total failure. How, then, it may be asked, do I expect that similar opposition will not be made to the Boards? I answer, Because Roman Catholics, by the constitution of the Board, are admitted to a share in the management of the public fund appropriated to that object; and when they are thus accosted, in a fair and liberal spirit, I doubt not that they will be found to co-operate with Protestants in diffusing the light even of revealed truth among the people, to an extent far beyond what is anticipated.'

ART. IX. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

In the press, and nearly ready for publication, in four volumes, 8vo, *History Philosophically Illustrated, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the Revolution of France.* By George Miller, D.D. M.R.I.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. The work now presented to the public is a condensed, yet much improved Edition of that which was published at intervals in eight volumes, 8vo, in the shape of Lectures, as originally delivered in the University of Dublin.

Shortly will appear, a Second Edition of the *Divarication of the New Testament*, considerably enlarged in the Doctrinal Department; and with a Coloured Diagram, which fully illustrates those important ideas, Time and Eternity, and demonstrates the Immortality of the Soul, and a Future State, to the plainest capacity. By Thomas Wirgman, Esq. The question of the mutilation of Scripture, which now agitates the religious world, is here finally settled, by the implicit adoption of the *entire Word of God*.

In the press, the *Western Garland*, a Collection of Original Melodies, composed and arranged for the Piano Forte, by the leading Professors of the West of Scotland. The words by the Author of "*The Chameleon*;" in a beautifully got up quarto volume.

Nearly ready for Publication, in small 8vo, *MÉLANGE*, in French and English, in Prose and Verse, by Marin de la Voye.

Early in May will be published (dedicated by permission to Her Majesty), *The Messiah*; a Poem in Six Books. By the Author of '*The Omnipresence of the Deity*,' &c. &c.

An Offering of Sympathy to Parents bereaved of their Children, and to others under Affliction, from Manuscripts not before published; with an Appendix of Selections from the writings of Dr. Wardlaw, Dr. Balfour, Dr. Barnes, &c. is Reprinting from the American Edition, and will appear about the middle of this month.

Early in April, will be published, *Elements of Mechanics*, comprehending the Theory of Equilibrium and of Motion, and the first Principles of Physical Astronomy; together with a variety of Statical and Dynamical Problems. By J. R. Young.

In the press, and will be published in May, in One Volume, 4to, (dedicated by permission to His Grace the Duke of Northumberland,) *Pyrus Malus Brentfordiensis*, a Descriptive Catalogue of the most valuable Sorts of Apples. By Hugh Ronalds. With a Coloured Figure to each. To which are added, appropriate Lists of different situations in which Apple-Trees are usually planted

Speedily will be published, the two concluding Volumes of the *Tour of a German Prince*, with a Portrait. Containing his route through Germany and Holland, his descriptions of the external aspect of England, and his Observations on the Society and Manners of the Metropolis, and of other places of fashionable resort.

Lady Sandford of Glasgow has in the press, "Stories from the History of Rome," addressed to a little boy.

In the press, and speedily will be published, in two closely printed volumes, demy 8vo, the Greek Testament, accompanied with English Notes, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical, by the Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, D.D. F.S.A. Vicar of Bisbrooke; Author of the "*Re-censio Synoptica Annotationis Sacrae*", and also of the new translation and the new edition of *Thucydides* with Notes. Of this edition the Text has been most carefully and critically formed on the basis of the last edition of R. Stephens (adopted by Mill), which differs very slightly from, but is preferable to, the common Text. From this there has been no deviation, except on the most preponderating evidence; such alterations only having been introduced, as rest on the united authority of MSS., ancient Versions and Fathers, and the early printed editions, (especially the invaluable *Editio Princeps*), and have been adopted in one or more of the *critical* editions of Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthæi, and Scholz. The division of the Text is not into verses, (which, however, are expressed in the inner margin,) but into paragraphs, distributed, according to the subjects, on the authority of the most eminent Editors. The punctuation has been throughout most carefully corrected and adjusted, from a comparison of all the best editions, from the *Editio Princeps* to that of Scholz. To each verse is subjoined, in the outer margin, a select body of the most apposite parallel references. Under the Text, in closely printed columns, are copious English Notes, comprising whatever respects the interpretation, and tends to the establishment of the grammatical sense, the connexion, and scope of the writer; and in which, together with the greatest comprehensiveness, the utmost compression has been adopted, consistent with perspicuity; so as to form an epitome of exegetical and philological annotation.

In the course of April will be published, in one volume 8vo, the *Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh*. By Sir Roger Greisley, Bart. F.A.S.

In the press, *Instructions for preparing Abstracts of Titles*, after the most improved system of eminent Conveyancers; shewing, I. The Points to be observed in deducing Titles to Freehold, &c.; II. The Title of the Abstract, and the Method of abstracting ordinary Deeds; and III. The Form of an Abstract containing every species of Assurance. In one volume 12mo.

In the press, a General Analytical Index to the Edinburgh Review, from Vol. XXI. to L.; comprehending in one alphabetical series, distinct References to all the Names of Authors reviewed, Titles of Books reviewed, Authorities cited or quoted, Public Questions discussed, and all incidental matter; with a separate Index of Books reviewed, and another of Authors reviewed.

In the press, a Treatise on the Preparation of Printing Ink, both Black and Coloured. By William Savage, Author of "Practical Hints on Decorative Printing." In 8vo.

Shortly will be published, the Juvenile Philosopher, by T. Keyworth, exhibiting, in a familiar manner, the Principles of the Steam-Engine, Orrery, and Tellurian, with illustrative Wood-cuts; adapted for schools and young persons.

Mr. Babbage is preparing for the press, a work on the "Economy of Machinery and Manufactures." It is intended to comprise, in a small volume, the results of his observations in the various mechanical processes used in the arts; and also to explain the domestic economy of the interior of our great manufactories, by which the cheapness of their products is insured. The latter chapters will be devoted to the political economy of manufactures; and the principles will be delivered in a form rendered popular by a continual reference to practical illustrations.

The Rev. Charles Eyre has nearly ready for publication, an Illustration of St. Paul's Epistles, inclusive of an entirely new and independent Translation.

Early this month will be published, *Elisabeth, ou les Exilés de Sibérie, de Madame de Cottin*. Arranged for students commencing the French language, with an Analytical Translation in the order of the text; the pronunciation indicated according to the best French authorities; explanatory Notes; and an alphabetical Reference to all the words made use of. Adapted to the use of schools, by S. B. P. L.

ART. X. WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

On Political Economy, in Connection with the Moral State and Moral Prospects of Society. By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburgh. 8vo. 12s.

A Letter to the Royal Commissioners for the Visitation of Colleges in Scotland. By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. 8vo. 2s.

THEOLOGY.

An Antidote to Sudden Fears; or the Calmness in which Christians may contemplate the threatening Pestilence. A Discourse preached in the Independent Meeting House, Stoke Newington, on Lord's Day, February 19, 1832. By John Jefferson. 8vo. 1s.

Quesnel on the Gospels. With an Introductory Essay, by the Rev. D. Wilson, London. In Three Vols. 18s. bds.

Hall on the Faith and Influence of the Gospel. With an Introductory Essay, by Thomas Chalmers, D.D., Edinburgh. 5s. bds.

TRAVELS.

Researches in Greece and the Levant. By the Rev. John Hartley, late Missionary in the Mediterranean. 12mo. 6s.

A Description of a singular Aboriginal Race inhabiting the Summit of the Neilgherry Hills, or Blue Mountains of Coimbatore, in the Southern Peninsula of India. By Capt. Henry Harkness of the Madras Army. royal 8vo.